arXiv:1412.2026v2 [math.PR] 9 Dec 2014

ON MULTIVARIATE STRONG RENEWAL THEOREM

Zhiyi Chi
Department of Statistics, University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT 06269, USA. E-mail: zhiyi.chi@uconn.edu

December 10, 2014

Abstract

This paper takes the so-called probabilistic approach to the Strong Renewal Theorem (SRT) on $\mathbb{R}^d$ for distributions in the domain of attraction without centering of a nondegenerate stable law of exponent $\alpha \in (0,2] \cap (0,d)$. We obtain a version of the SRT that allows for distributions with various lattice or nonlattice components, and derive a general device to ensure the convergence which is essential to the SRT. Examples of application of the device are given, including some that provide a unified treatment to known results but with substantially weaker assumptions.

Keywords and phrases. Renewal, regular variation, infinitely divisible, large deviations.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 60K05, 60F10.

1 Introduction

Let F be a probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}^d$. The Strong Renewal Theorem (SRT) for F concerns the nontrivial asymptotic behavior of $U(x+E) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} F^{*n}(x+E)$ as $|x| \to \infty$, where F^{*n} is the n-fold convolution of F with itself, E is a fixed set, and $x+E = \{x+y : y \in E\}$. Comparing to the approach based on Fourier analysis of the renewal measure $U(\mathrm{d}x)$ [6, 9, 11, 21, 23], the so-called probabilistic approach is able to tackle a wilder range of cases [3, 4, 7, 18, 22, 23]. Generally speaking, the latter deals with $\sum_{n \geq A(\delta|x|)} F^{*n}(x+E)$ and $\sum_{n < A(\delta|x|)} F^{*n}(x+E)$ separately, where A is a certain function and $\delta > 0$ a fixed arbitrarily small number. These two sums will be referred to as the "big-n" and "small-n" contributions, respectively. The big-n contribution can be tackled using Local Limit Theorems (LLTs), essentially yielding the limit of $|x|^d U(x+E)/A(|x|)$ provided it exists [4, 9, 11, 18, 23]. In contrast, without additional conditions, the small-n contribution may fail to converge as $|x| \to \infty$, hence ruling out the existence of limit [11, 22, 23]. Recently, to control the small-n contribution when $d = 1$, integral criteria were proposed [3, 4]. This paper extends the approach in [3, 4] to $d > 1$. The resultant criterion is easily applicable to a rather wide range of cases and also gives a unified treatment to many known results, sometimes with substantially weaker assumptions.

Henceforth, unless stated otherwise, assume that F is in the domain of attraction *without centering* of a *nondegenerate* stable law of exponent $\alpha \in (0,2]$. By definition, a distribution or random variable is nondegenerate if it is not concentrated in any linear manifold of dimension $d-1$ [17, Definition 24.16]. Each such stable law has an infinitely differentiable density with all derivatives vanishing at ∞ [17, Example 28.2]. Under the assumption, which we shall denote by $F \in \mathcal{D}_0'(\alpha)$, letting $a_n = A^{-1}(n)$ guarantees the weak convergence of $F^{*n}(a_n \mathrm{d}x)$ to the stable law, where A is the aforementioned function. For now it suffices to note that A is regularly varying with exponent α at ∞; see more detail in Section 1.1.

To continue, we need some notation. For random variable $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$, denote its characteristic function by $\varphi_X(t) = \mathbb{E}[e^{\mathrm{i}\langle t, X\rangle}]$, $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For $x_1, x_2, \ldots \in \mathbb{R}^d$, denote $S_0(x) = 0$ and $S_n(x) = S_{n-1}(x) + x_n$, $n \geq 1$. Denote $B_d = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \leq 1\}$, $S^{d-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| = 1\}$, and $I_d = [0,1)^d$. For $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}$, and D, $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, denote $cD = \{cy : y \in D\}$,

$\Lambda x = \{\lambda x : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$, $x + D = \{x + y : y \in D\}$, and $D + E = \{y + z : y \in D, z \in E\}$. Denote $M \in \Lambda^{m\times d}$ if M is an $m \times d$ matrix of elements in Λ, and $MD = \{My : y \in D\}$. Denote by $\mathrm{diag}(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ the diagonal matrix with the i^{th} diagonal element being a_i, and Id_n the $n \times n$ identity matrix. For a linear subspace V of $\mathbb{R}^d$, denote by π_V the projection onto V. Recall that two integers are said to be coprime if their greatest common divisor is 1, and $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ are said to be rationally independent if for $m_1, \ldots, m_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\sum m_i a_i \in \mathbb{Z} \iff$ all $m_i = 0$ [14, p. 51]. Finally, a distribution or random variable is said to be lattice if it is concentrated on $a + \Gamma$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and lattice $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ [1, p. 350]. By definition, Γ is an additive subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^d$ which has no cluster points [20, p. 114].

It is well understood that the big-n contribution has to be handled differently for lattice distributions and nonlattice ones [1, 12, 16, 19]. A random variable in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $d > 1$ may have both lattice and nonlattice components. For a nondegenerate random variable, the lattice-nonlattice makeup can be described as follows.

Proposition 1.1. *Let F be a nondegenerate distribution on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then there exist a linear subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, a nonsingular $T \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$, integers $0 \le \nu \le r \le d$, and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $q = 1$ if $\nu = 0$, such that the following are true. For $X \sim F$, $\pi_V(X)$ is lattice, $|\varphi_X(2\pi v)| < 1$ for $v \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus V$, $|\varphi_{TX}(2\pi u)| = 1 \iff u = (u_1, \ldots, u_r, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $u_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and writing $TX = (Y, Z)$ with $Y \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d-r}$, $\mathbb{P}\{Y \in \beta + \mathbb{Z}^r\} = 1$ with $\beta = (0, \ldots, 0, \beta_\nu, \beta_{\nu+1}, \ldots, \beta_r)$, where $0 \le \nu \le r$, $\beta_{\nu+1}, \ldots, \beta_r \in (0, 1) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ are rationally independent, and if $\nu > 0$, $\beta_\nu = p/q \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $0 \le p < q$ being coprime. Furthermore, V, r, ν, and q are unique, and $r = \dim(V)$.*

From the result, to get the SRT for X, one in principle can first transform X into (Y, Z), get the SRT for the latter, and then turn this SRT into the one for X. While this back-and-forth procedure is not entirely trivial, the technical issues it involves are of secondary importance. For simplicity, we will suppose $X = (Y, Z)$. Denote

$$l_0 = (0, \ldots, 0, \beta_\nu) \in ([0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q})^\nu, \quad w_0 = (\beta_{\nu+1}, \ldots, \beta_r) \in ((0, 1) \setminus \mathbb{Q})^{r-\nu}.$$

Partition Y as $(L, W) \in \mathbb{R}^\nu \times \mathbb{R}^{r-\nu}$. Then $X = (L, W, Z)$. Similarly, for $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ i.i.d. $\sim X$, write $X_i = (L_i, W_i, Z_i)$.

Recall that a matrix $K \in \mathbb{Z}^{d\times d}$ has an inverse in $\mathbb{Z}^{d\times d} \iff \det K = \pm 1$, in which case K^{-1} is $\det K$ times the adjugate of K. Fix any $K \in \mathbb{Z}^{d\times d}$ with $\det K = \pm 1$. Define

$$D = \mathrm{diag}(1, \ldots, 1, q), \quad \Delta_h = D^{-1} K I_\nu \times (h I_{d-\nu}), \quad h > 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where we identify Δ_h with hI_d if $\nu = 0$. As seen later, when $\nu > 0$, it is useful to consider $K \ne \mathrm{Id}_d$. In the following, we use asymptotic notations such as $\gg_\delta$, whose meaning is specified in Section 1.1.

Theorem 1.2 (Big-n contribution)**.** *Let $d > \alpha$. Let $X \sim F \in \mathcal{D}_0'(\alpha)$ and ψ be the density of the limiting stable law of $S_n(X)/a_n$. Suppose $X = (L, W, Z)$ as above. Given $\delta > 0$ and $h > 0$, for $s > 0$ and $\omega \in S^{d-1}$, define*

$$r_{\delta,h}(s\omega) = \frac{s^d}{A(s)} \sum_{n \ge A(\delta s)} F^{*n}(s\omega + \Delta_h).$$

For $\omega \in S^{d-1}$ and $s > 0$, define

$$\varrho_s(\omega) = \alpha q^{-1} \int_0^{1/s} \psi(u\omega) u^{d-\alpha-1} \, \mathrm{d}u. \tag{1.2}$$

Then as $s \to \infty$,

$$\sup_{\omega \in S^{d-1}} |r_{\delta,h}(s\omega) - h^{d-\nu} \varrho_\delta(\omega)| = o_{\delta,h}(1). \tag{1.3}$$

Remark 1.1. By 2) of Proposition 1.3 below, when $d = \nu$, i.e., $X = L$, Theorem 1.2 is implied by [23], Eq. (3.6) for aperiodic random walks. A random variable $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is said to be aperiodic if for $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\langle t, \xi \rangle \in \mathbb{Z} \iff t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and strongly aperiodic if $\langle t, \xi \rangle \in c + \mathbb{Z}$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R} \iff t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ [cf. 18, T7.1, P7.8]. Conversely, using Theorem 1.2 and 1) of Proposition 1.3, one can treat the aperiodic case by a different argument from [18], P26.1 and [23]. See the discussion at the end of Section 6.

Proposition 1.3. *1) For nondegenerate* $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, *it is aperiodic* $\iff$ *there are* $K \in \mathbb{Z}^{\nu \times \nu}$ *with* $\det K = \pm 1$ *and coprime integers* $0 \le p < q$, *such that* $\xi = K^{-1}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{\nu-1}, p + q\zeta_\nu)$ *with* $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_\nu)$ *being strongly aperiodic.*

2) For D *and* L *as Proposition 1.1,* DL *is aperiodic.*

Theorem 1.2 indicates what should be done for the small-n contribution. Specifically, the following statement holds.

Corollary 1.4. *Under the conditions in Theorem 1.2,*

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \overline{\lim_{s \to \infty}} \sup_{\omega \in S^{d-1}} \frac{s^d}{A(s)} \sum_{n < A(\delta s)} F^{*n}(s\omega + hI_d) = 0 \tag{1.4}$$

$$\iff \lim_{s \to \infty} \sup_{\omega \in S^{d-1}} |r_{0,h}(s\omega) - h^{d-\nu} \varrho_0(\omega)| = 0 \tag{1.5}$$

$$\text{and } \lim_{\delta \to 0} \sup_{\omega \in S^{d-1}} |\varrho_0(\omega) - \varrho_\delta(\omega)| = 0. \tag{1.6}$$

Remark 1.2. 1) Since $r_{0,h}(s\omega) = [s^d/A(s)]U(s\omega + \Delta_h)$, we will say that the SRT holds for F if (1.5) holds. In Example 5-B of [23], it is remarked that to establish the SRT, one needs to have $\varrho_0(\omega) < \infty$ as well as (1.4). However, by Corollary 1.4, this is unnecessary.

2) Corollary 1.4 is weaker than Proposition A of [4] which essentially states that for $d = 1$, $\sum F^{*n}(x + [0, h))$ converges as $x \to \pm\infty \iff$ (1.4) holds, and if either happens the limit must be $h\varrho_0$. However, the argument for that result does not apply to $d > 1$.

3) If $\alpha = 2$, then normality of the stable density ensures (1.6). If $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and $d > 1$, the uniform convergence in (1.6) becomes a subtle issue; see Example 5-B in [23] and Example 2.1. A sufficient condition (1.6) will be given in Proposition 2.7.

Proof. Since ψ is bounded and $d > \alpha$, $\sup \varrho_s < \infty$ for $s > 0$ and $\varrho_s \uparrow \varrho_0$ as $s \downarrow 0$. Clearly, $r_{0,h}(s\omega) \ge r_{1,h}(s\omega)$. By (1.3), for $s \gg 1$, $\sup_\omega r_{1,h}(s\omega) < \infty$, so by

$$r_{0,h}(s\omega) - r_{1,h}(s\omega) = (s^d/A(s)) \sum_{n < A(s)} F^{*n}(s\omega + \Delta_h) \le s^d,$$

$\sup_\omega r_{0,h}(s\omega) < \infty$. Therefore, the differences in (1.5) and (1.6) are well-defined.

Suppose (1.4) holds for one $h > 0$. Then it holds for any $c > 0$ if hI_d is replaced with cJ_d, where $J_d = (-1, 1)^d$. Fix $c > 0$ such that $\Delta_h \subset cJ_d$. Given $\epsilon > 0$, by (1.4) with hI_d replaced with cJ_d, there are $\eta > 0$ and $s_0 = s_0(\eta) > 0$, such that $\sup_\omega [r_{0,h}(s\omega) - r_{\eta,h}(s\omega)] \le h^{d-\nu}\epsilon$ for $s \ge s_0$, and by Theorem 1.2, s_0 can be set so that $\sup_\omega |r_{\eta,h}(s\omega) - h^{d-\nu}\varrho_\eta(\omega)| \le h^{d-\nu}\epsilon$ as well. The first inequality yields $0 \le r_{\delta,h}(s\omega) - r_{\eta,h}(s\omega) < h^{d-\nu}\epsilon$ for $\delta \in (0, \eta)$ and

$\omega \in S^{d-1}$. By Theorem 1.2 again, for any $\delta \in (0, \eta)$, there is $s_1 = s_1(\delta) \geq s_0$, such that $\sup_\omega |r_{\delta,h}(s\omega) - h^{d-\nu}\varrho_\delta(\omega)| \leq h^{d-\nu}\epsilon$, $s \geq s_1$. It follows that

$$h^{d-\nu}\varrho_\delta(\omega) \leq r_{\delta,h}(s\omega) + h^{d-\nu}\epsilon \leq r_{\eta,h}(s\omega) + 2h^{d-\nu}\epsilon \leq h^{d-\nu}\varrho_\eta(\omega) + 3h^{d-\nu}\epsilon,$$

giving $0 \leq \varrho_0 - \varrho_\eta \leq 3\epsilon$ and (1.6). By $|r_{0,h}(s\omega) - h^{d-\nu}\varrho_0(\omega)| \leq |r_{0,h}(s\omega) - r_{\eta,h}(s\omega)| + h^{d-\nu}|\varrho_0(\omega) - \varrho_\eta(\omega)| + |r_{\eta,h}(s\omega) - h^{d-\nu}\varrho_\eta(\omega)|$, it is not hard to show (1.5). Conversely, together with Theorem 1.2, (1.5) and (1.6) imply that given $\epsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that $\overline{\lim}_{s\to\infty} \sup_\omega |r_{0,h}(s\omega) - r_{\delta,h}(s\omega)| < \epsilon$, so (1.4) holds if hI_d therein is replaced with Δ_h. Since hI_d can be covered by a finite number of $z + \Delta_h$, then (1.4) follows. □

To control the small-n contribution, detail of the lattice-nonlattice makeup of F is irrelevant. Given $F \in \mathcal{D}_0'(\alpha)$, for $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $a > 0$, $r > 0$, and $h > 0$, define

$$K(t, a, \eta, h) = \int_{|z|<\eta|t|} F(t - z + hI_d)e^{-|z|/a}\,\mathrm{d}z. \tag{1.7}$$

Also, define

$$\kappa = \lfloor d/\alpha \rfloor. \tag{1.8}$$

Theorem 1.5 (Small-n contribution)**.** *Let $d > \alpha$. Let $F \in \mathcal{D}_0'(\alpha)$ and $X, X_1, X_2, \ldots$ i.i.d. $\sim F$. There is a constant $\chi > 0$ that only depends on $\{F, A\}$, such that given $0 < \theta < 1/\kappa$, $\eta > 0$, and $\epsilon > 0$, for $0 < \delta \ll_{\theta,\eta,\epsilon} 1$, $s \gg_{\theta,\eta,\epsilon,\delta} 1$, and $n \leq A(\delta s)$,*

$$\sup_{\omega\in S^{d-1}} F^{*n}(s\omega + hI_d) \ll_h na_n^{-d} \sup_{|t|>\theta s} K(t, a_n/\chi, \eta, h) + \epsilon_n(s)$$

with $\epsilon_n(s) > 0$ satisfying

$$\sum_{n\leq A(\delta s)} \sup_{r\geq s} \epsilon_n(r) \ll \epsilon A(s)/s^d.$$

In particular,

$$\sum_{n\leq A(\delta s)} \sup_{|x|\geq s} F^{*n}(x + hI_d) \ll_h \sum_{n\leq A(\delta s)} na_n^{-d} \sup_{|t|>\theta s} K(t, a_n/\chi, \eta, h) + \epsilon A(s)/s^d.$$

In Section 2 applications of the above theorems, in particular, Theorem 1.5 are given. Starting Section 3, we prove the theorems. Section 3 considers the multivariate Lévy concentration function following [15], §1.5. Section 4 establishes certain local large deviation bounds using the Lévy concentration function, following the treatment for $d = 1$ [5]. The result in this section will be used for both Theorems 1.2 and 1.5. Section 5 proves Proposition 1.1 and generalizes the well-known LLTs for distributions concentrated on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and nonlattice distributions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ [16, 19], allowing for distributions that have both lattice and nonlattice components. In Sections 6 and 7, Theorems 1.2 and 1.5 are proved, respectively.

1.1 Preliminaries

For $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d)$, besides the Euclidean norm $|x|$, we will use the sup-norm $\|x\| = \max_i |x_i|$. Denote $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$ and $a \wedge b = \min(a, b)$. For $c \in \mathbb{R}$, denote $c_+ = c \vee 0$.

If $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, denote by $\widehat{f}(t) = \int e^{\mathrm{i}\langle t,x\rangle} f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$, $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, its Fourier transform. If $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a random variable, then for $s \geq 0$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$, denote

$$\begin{aligned} q_X(s) &= \mathbb{P}\{|X| > s\}, \\ c_X(s) &= \mathbb{E}[X\mathbf{1}\{|X| \leq s\}], \\ m_X(s,u) &= \mathbb{E}[\langle u, X\rangle^2 \mathbf{1}\{|X| \leq s\}], \\ V_X(s) &= \mathbb{E}[|X|^2 \mathbf{1}\{|X| \leq s\}]. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, $F \in \mathcal{D}'(\alpha)$ if there are real numbers $a_n \to \infty$ and b_n, such that for $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ i.i.d. $\sim F$, $S_n(X)/a_n - b_n$ weakly converges to a nondegenerate stable law with exponent $\alpha \in (0,2]$; see [16], Theorems 4.1–4.2, for necessary and sufficient conditions for $F \in \mathcal{D}'(\alpha)$. If $X \sim F \in \mathcal{D}'(\alpha)$, then $V_X \in \mathcal{R}_{2-\alpha}$, where for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{R}_\theta$ denotes the class of functions that are regularly varying at ∞ with exponent θ, and if $\alpha = 2$, there is a symmetric positive definite matrix Σ, such that $m_X(s,u)/V_X(s) \to u'\Sigma u > 0$ uniformly for $u \in S^{d-1}$ [16, Theorems 2.4, 4.1–4.2]. As $s \to \infty$, $q_X(s) = (2/\alpha - 1 + o(1))V_X(s)/s^2$ [1, Theorem 1.6.4]. Let $A(s)$ be a strictly increasing and smooth function on $[0,\infty)$ with

$$A(0) = 0, \quad A'(s) \asymp A(s)/s \text{ for } s > 0, \quad A(s) = [1 + o(1)]s^2/V_X(s) \to \infty \text{ as } s \to \infty.$$

Then $q_X(s) = O(1/A(s))$ for $s \gg 1$ and letting $a_n = A^{-1}(n)$ ensures the weak convergence of $S_n(X)/a_n - b_n$ to the aforementioned stable law [16, Theorems 4.1–4.2; 1, p. 347]. We shall always define $a_0 = 1$. By definition, $F \in \mathcal{D}_0'(\alpha)$ if the weak convergence holds with $b_n = 0$, in which case the limiting law is strictly stable [2, §9.8]. For $F \in \mathcal{D}'(\alpha)$,

$$F \in \mathcal{D}_0'(\alpha) \Longleftrightarrow (n/a_n)c_X(a_n) \text{ converges as } n \to \infty \tag{1.9}$$

[16, p. 190–191; 1, p. 347].

Henceforth, F and A are fixed. Given functions f and g, "$f(x) = O(g(x))$ for $x \in D$", "$f(x) \ll g(x)$ for $x \in D$", and "$g(x) \gg f(x)$ for $x \in D$" all mean $|f(x)| \leq C|g(x)|$ on D for some constant $C > 0$ that only depends on $\{F, A\}$, and "$f(x) \asymp g(x)$ for $x \in D$" means $g(x) \ll f(x) \ll g(x)$ on D. If C is a constant that depends on certain parameters $a_1, \ldots, a_k$ in addition to $\{F, A\}$, then denote $f(x) = O_{a_1,\ldots,a_k}(g(x))$, $f(x) \ll_{a_1,\ldots,a_n} g(x)$, or $g(x) \gg_{a_1,\ldots,a_n} f(x)$. On the other hand, by $f(x) = o_{a_1,\ldots,a_k}(g(x))$ as $x \to \infty$ we mean there is a function $M(\epsilon)$ of $\epsilon > 0$ that only depends on $\{F,\ A,\ a_1, \ldots, a_k\}$, such that $|f(x)| \leq \epsilon|g(x)|$ for all $x \geq M(\epsilon)$.

2 Applications

In this section, we shall always assume that $F \in \mathcal{D}_0'(\alpha)$ satisfies the conditions in Theorem 1.2. The following formulas will be repeatedly used. Given β, for $s \gg 1$, by change of variable and $A'(s) \asymp A(s)/s$,

$$\tilde{A}_\beta(s) := \sum_{n \leq A(s)} n a_n^{-\beta} \ll \int_1^{A(s)} \frac{u\,\mathrm{d}u}{(A^{-1}(u))^\beta} \ll \int_{a_1}^{s} \frac{A(u)^2\,\mathrm{d}u}{u^{\beta+1}} \ll \begin{cases} A(s)^2 s^{-\beta} & \text{if } \alpha > \beta/2 \\ O(1) & \text{if } \alpha < \beta/2. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Example 2.1. Consider the following modified version of Example 5-A in [23]. Let $d > 1$. Let $\xi \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, such that for $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\xi = k\} = \mathbb{P}\{\xi = -k\} = \begin{cases} ck^{-1-d/2} \ln k & \text{if } k \notin \{2^n : n \geq 1\} \\ ck^{-d/2}/b_k & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $c > 0$ is the normalizing constant and $b_k \gg 1$. Let $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_d)$, with X_i i.i.d. $\sim \xi$. By [23], if $d = 2, 3$ and $b_k \ll 1 + \ln k$, then (1.5) fails to hold for X. The purpose here is to show that if $d = 2, 3$, then the SRT (1.5) holds $\iff \ln k = o(b_k)$ as $k \to \infty$, and if $d = 4$, then the SRT (1.5) holds $\iff (\ln k)^2 = o(b_k)$.

Without loss of generality, let $h = 1$, so $hI_1 = [0, 1)$. Let $b_k = b(k)$, where $b(z)$ is constant in each $[k, k + 1)$. First, let $d = 2$ or 3. We only need to show that if $\ln k = o(b_k)$, then the SRT (1.5) holds. By [23], $X \sim -X \in \mathcal{D}_0'(\alpha)$ with $\alpha = d/2 \in (0, 2)$. Since

$$\mathbb{P}\{\xi > s\} \leq q_X(s) = \mathbb{P}\{|X| > s\} \leq d\mathbb{P}\{|\xi| > s/\sqrt{d}\} \asymp \mathbb{P}\{\xi > s\} \asymp s^{-d/2} \ln s, \quad s \gg 1,$$

we can define $A(s) = s^{d/2}/\ln s$ for $s > 2$. To apply Theorem 1.5, fix $0 < \theta < 1/\kappa = 1/2$, and $0 < \eta < \theta/(10d)$. For $s \gg 1$ and $t = (t_1, \ldots, t_d)$ with $|t| > \theta s$, there is at least one $|t_i| > |t|/d$. Without loss of generality, let $i = 1$. Let $\chi > 0$ be the constant described in Theorem 1.5. Then

$$\begin{aligned} K(t, a_n/\chi, \eta, h) &= \int_{|z|<\eta|t|} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \mathbb{P}\{X_i \in t_i - z_i + I_1\} e^{-\chi|z|/a_n} \, \mathrm{d}z \\ &\leq \int_{|z_1|<\eta d|t_1|} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \mathbb{P}\{X_i \in t_i - z_i + I_1\} e^{-\chi|z_1|/a_n} \, \mathrm{d}z \\ &= h^{d-1} \int_{|z_1|<\eta d|t_1|} \mathbb{P}\{\xi \in t_1 - z_1 + I_1\} e^{-\chi|z_1|/a_n} \, \mathrm{d}z_1 \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

For each z_1, $t_1 - z_1 + I_1$ contains exactly one $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $|z_1| < \eta d|t_1|$. If $k \notin \{\pm 2^n : n \geq 1\}$, then $\mathbb{P}\{\xi \in t_1 - z_1 + I_1\} = c|k|^{-1-d/2} \ln |k|$, so by $|t_1| \asymp |t|$ and $|z_1| < |t_1|/10$, $\mathbb{P}\{\xi \in t_1 - z_1 + hI_1\} \asymp |t|^{-1-d/2} \ln |t| = q_X(|t|)/|t|$. Likewise, if $k \in \{\pm 2^n : n \geq 1\}$, then $\mathbb{P}\{\xi \in t_1 - z_1 + I_1\} \ll |t|^{-d/2}/b(t) \ll q_X(|t|)/(b(|t|) \ln |t|)$. It can be seen that the set of $z_1 \in (-\eta d|t_1|, \eta d|t_1|)$ with $t_1 - z_1 + I_1$ containing one $k \in \{\pm 2^n : n \geq 1\}$ is a single interval of length at most 1. Then

$$K(t, a_n/\chi, \eta, h) \ll \frac{q_X(|t|)}{|t|} \int e^{-\chi|z_1|/a_n} \, \mathrm{d}z_1 + \frac{q_X(|t|)}{b(|t|) \ln |t|} \ll \frac{a_n q_X(|t|)}{|t|} + \frac{q_X(|t|)}{b(|t|) \ln |t|}.$$

Since $q_X(s) \asymp 1/A(s)$ and $q_X(s)/(\ln s)^2 \asymp A(s)/s^d$, if $\ln s = o(b(s))$ as $s \to \infty$, then

$$\sum_{n \leq A(\delta s)} n a_n^{-d} \sup_{|t|>\theta s} K(t, a_n/\chi, \eta, h) \ll \frac{\tilde{A}_{d-1}(\delta s)}{sA(s)} + o(A(s)/s^d)\tilde{A}_d(\delta s). \tag{2.3}$$

Given $\delta > 0$, for $s \gg_\delta 1$, by (2.1) $\tilde{A}_{d-1}(\delta s) \ll A(\delta s)^2/(\delta s)^{d-1} \ll \delta s/(\ln s)^2$, while

$$\tilde{A}_d(\delta s) \ll \int_{a_1}^{\delta s} \frac{A(u)^2 \, \mathrm{d}u}{u^{d+1}} \ll \int_{a_1}^{2} \frac{A(u)^2 \, \mathrm{d}u}{u^{d+1}} + \int_{2}^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{u(\ln u)^2} < \infty.$$

Then the LHS in (2.3) is $O(\delta(\ln s)^{-2}/A(s))+o(A(s)/s^d) = O(\delta A(s)/s^d)$. Since δ is arbitrary, then by Theorem 1.5, (1.4) holds. Thus by Corollary 1.4, the SRT (1.5) holds.

Next let $d = 4$. Then $\mathbb{E}|X|^2 = \infty$. However, as $s \to \infty$, $s^2 q_X(s) \asymp \ln s$,

$$V_X(s) = \int_0^s u^2 \mathbb{P}\{|X| \in \mathrm{d}u\} = 2\int_0^s u(q_X(u) - q_X(s))\,\mathrm{d}u \asymp (\ln s)^2,$$

and for $t = (t_1, \dots, t_4)$,

$$m_X(s,t) = \sum_{i=1}^4 t_i^2 \mathbb{E}[X_i^2 \mathbf{1}\{|X| \le s\}] + \sum_{i \ne j} t_i t_j \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j \mathbf{1}\{|X| \le s\}] = |t|^2 V_X(s)/d.$$

Then by Theorem 4.1 of [16], $X \sim -X \in \mathcal{D}_0'(2)$ and we can set $A(s) = s^2/(\ln s)^2$ for $s > 2$. The bound just before (2.3) still holds. Then

$$\sum_{n \le A(\delta s)} n a_n^{-4} \sup_{|t| > \theta s} K(t, a_n/\chi, \eta, h) \ll \frac{q_X(s)\tilde{A}_3(\delta s)}{s} + \frac{q_X(s)\tilde{A}_4(\delta s)}{b(s)\ln s}. \tag{2.4}$$

Given $\delta > 0$, for $s \gg_\delta 1$, as $A(s) = s^2/(\ln s)^2$, by similar calculation as in the case $d = 2$ or 3, $\tilde{A}_3(\delta s) \ll \delta s/(\ln s)^4$ and $\tilde{A}_4(\delta s) = O(1)$. Then the LHS of (2.4) is $s^{-4}A(s)O(\delta/\ln s + (\ln s)^2/b(s))$. Thus, if $(\ln s)^2 = o(b(s))$, then (1.5) holds. Conversely, if $b(s)/(\ln s)^2 \not\to \infty$, then by similar argument as in [23], (1.4) cannot hold. Since in the normal case (1.6) holds, by Corollary 1.4, the SRT (1.5) cannot hold. □

Example 2.2. Let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ be symmetric and stable with exponent $\alpha \in (0,2)$. Let $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ with X_i i.i.d. $\sim \xi$. By Example 5-B of [23], if $\alpha \le (d-1)/2$, then $\varrho_0(e_i) = \infty$, where $e_1, \dots, e_d$ are the standard base vectors of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then by Corollary 1.4, the SRT (1.5) cannot hold for X. We show that if $\alpha > (d-1)/2$ (so $d \le 4$), then the SRT (1.5) holds for X. Fixing θ and η as in Example 2.1, (2.2) still holds. Then by $\mathbb{P}\{\xi \in x + I\} \ll_h |x|^{-\alpha-1}$, for $t = (t_1, \dots, t_d)$ with $|t| \gg \theta s$,

$$K(t, a_n/\chi, \eta, h) \ll_h |t|^{-\alpha-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\chi|u|/a_n}\mathrm{d}u \ll a_n |t|^{-\alpha-1},$$

where we can set $a_n = n^{1/\alpha}$ and $A(t) = t^\alpha$. As a result,

$$\sum_{n \le A(\delta s)} n a_n^{-d} \sup_{|t| > \theta s} K(t, a_n/\chi, \eta, h) \ll_h s^{-\alpha-1} \sum_{n \le A(\delta s)} n^{1-(d-1)/\alpha} \ll \delta^{2\alpha-d+1} A(s)/s^d.$$

Then by Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.4, the SRT holds for X.

The next result is a multivariate version of a result in [3, 4]. Define

$$\omega(x) = |x|^d F(x + hI_d) A(|x|).$$

The condition $\sup \omega < \infty$ for $d = 1$ played a critical role in several works [7, 22, 23].

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\alpha \in (0,2] \cap (0, d/2)$. Suppose there are $T \ge 0$ and $\eta > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_\omega \int_{|z| < \eta s} [\omega(s\omega - z) - T]_+ \,\mathrm{d}z = o(A(s)^2), \quad s \to \infty, \tag{2.5}$$

then for $0 < \delta \ll 1$

$$\sum_{n \le A(\delta s)} n a_n^{-d} \sup_{|t| \ge \theta s} K(t, a_n/\chi, \eta, h) = [o(1) + \delta^{2\alpha}] \frac{A(s)}{s^d}, \quad s \to \infty \tag{2.6}$$

and consequently the SRT (1.5) *as well as* (1.6) *holds for* F.

Proof. Fix $0 < \theta < 1/\kappa$. For $s \gg 1$, $n \ge 1$, and t, $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|t| \ge \theta s$ and $|z| \le \eta |t|$, $|t-z|^d A(|t-z|) \asymp |t|^d A(|t|)$. Let $\chi > 0$ be the constant described in Theorem 1.5. Then

$$\begin{aligned} K(t, a/\chi, \eta, h) &\ll \frac{1}{|t|^d A(|t|)} \int_{|z| < \eta |t|} \omega(t-z) e^{-\chi |z|/a} \, \mathrm{d}z \\ &\ll \frac{1}{|t|^d A(|t|)} \left[\int_{|z| < \eta |t|} [\omega(t-z) - T]_+ \, dz + T \int e^{-\chi |z|/a} \, \mathrm{d}z \right] \\ &\le o(1) \frac{A(|t|)}{|t|^d} + \frac{a^d}{|t|^d A(|t|)} \end{aligned}$$

which combined with (2.1) yields (2.6). Then by Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.4, both (1.5) and (1.6) hold. □

The next result is established in [23] for F aperiodic on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. We shall give an alternative proof for the general case.

Proposition 2.4. *If* $d/2 < \alpha \in (0, 2)$, *then the SRT holds for* F.

Proof. Let $X \sim F$. For $|t| \gg_h 1$, any $a > 0$, and any $\eta \in (0, 1/3]$,

$$\begin{aligned} K(t, a, 1/3, h) &\le \int_{|z| \le |t|/3} \mathrm{d}z \int \mathbf{1}\{x \in t - z + hI_d\} F(\mathrm{d}x) \\ &= \int_{|z| \le |t|/3} \mathrm{d}z \int_{|x| > |t|/3} \mathbf{1}\{x \in t - z + hI_d\} F(\mathrm{d}x) \\ &\le \int_{|x| > |t|/3} F(\mathrm{d}x) \int \mathbf{1}\{x - t + z \in hI_d\} \, \mathrm{d}z = h^d q_X(|t|/3). \end{aligned}$$

Then, letting $\chi > 0$ be the constant described in Theorem 1.5,

$$\sum_{n \le A(\delta s)} n a_n^{-d} \sup_{|t| > \theta s} K(t, a_n/\chi, \eta, h) \ll q_X(s/3) \tilde{A}_d(\delta s). \tag{2.7}$$

Since $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, the RHS is $O(\tilde{A}_d(\delta s)/A(s)) \asymp \delta^{2\alpha - d} A(s)/s^d$, and hence the proof follows from Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.4. □

For $F \in \mathcal{D}_0'(2)$, the next result provides weaker conditions than [18], P 26.1, and [21].

Proposition 2.5. *Let* $\alpha = 2$. *Then the SRT holds for* $X \sim F$ *in each of the following cases. 1)* $d = 3$. *2)* $d = 4$ *and*

$$q_X(s) \int_1^s u^{-5} A(u)^2 \, \mathrm{d}u = o(A(s)/s^4), \quad s \to \infty.$$

3) $d \ge 5$ *and* $q_X(s) = o(s^{2-d})$.

Proof. The inequality in (2.7) still holds but now $q_X(s) = o(1/A(s))$ as $s \to \infty$. All we need to check is that $q_X(s)\tilde{A}_d(s) = o(A(s)/s^d)$ in each case. If $d = 3$, then by $\alpha = 2 > d/2$, $q_X(s)\tilde{A}_3(s) \asymp q_X(s)A(s)^2/s^3 = o(A(s)/s^3)$. If $d = 4$, then the proof directly follows from $\tilde{A}_4(s) \ll \int_1^s u^{-5}A(u)^2\,\mathrm{d}u$. Finally, if $d \geq 5$, then $\tilde{A}_d(\delta s) \leq \tilde{A}_d(\infty) < \infty$ and $A(s) \asymp s^2$ for $s \gg 1$. So $q_X(s) = o(s^{2-d})$ implies $q_X(s)\tilde{A}_d(s) = o(A(s)/s^d)$. □

Example 2.6. Let $d = 4$. If $\sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}|X|^2 < \infty$, then $A(s) \to s^2/\sigma^2$ and the condition in 2) of Proposition 2.5 becomes $q_X(s) = o(1/(s^2 \ln s))$, which is weaker than $\mathbb{E}|X|^2(\ln|X|)_+ < \infty$ required in [21]. Moreover, $\sigma^2 < \infty$ is not a necessary condition for the SRT. For example, suppose $q_X(s) \asymp 1/(s^2 \ln s)$. Then $\mathbb{E}|X|^2 = \infty$. Since $\int_1^s uq_X(u)\,\mathrm{d}u \asymp \int_1^s (u \ln u)^{-1}\,\mathrm{d}u \asymp \ln\ln s$, we can set $A(s) = s^2/\ln\ln s$ for $s \gg 1$. Then $\int_1^s A(u)^2u^{-5}\,\mathrm{d}u \sim \int_{100}^s (u(\ln\ln u)^2)^{-1}\,\mathrm{d}u \asymp \ln s/(\ln\ln s)^2$, and hence the condition in 2) is still satisfied and the SRT holds.

For $d \geq 5$, $q_X(s) = o(s^{2-d})$ is not a necessary condition for the SRT either. Indeed, by Proposition 2.3, if X has a density $f(x) \ll |x|^{-d}/A(|x|)$ that satisfies $s^2\int_{|x|\geq s} f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = o(\int_{|x|\leq s}|x|^2 f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x)$ as $s \to \infty$, then the SRT holds. It is easy to check that $f(x) \propto (1+|x|)^{-d-2}$ is such an example, which has $q_X(s) \asymp 1/s^2$ for $s \gg 1$. □

In Remark 1.2, it is pointed out that for a strictly stable distribution G on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with exponent $\alpha \in (0,2)$, the uniform convergence of ϱ_δ to ϱ_0 may fail to hold if $d > 1$, where ϱ_δ is defined in (1.2). We next give a sufficient condition for the uniform convergence. Let ψ be the density of G. By Theorem 14.10 in [17],

$$\widehat{\psi}(t) = \exp[-C\mathbb{E}f_\alpha(\langle\xi,t\rangle) + \mathrm{i}\langle\tau,t\rangle\mathbf{1}\{\alpha = 1\}], \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $C > 0$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are constants, $\xi \in S^{d-1}$ with $\mathbb{E}\xi = 0$ if $\alpha = 1$, and for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, $f_\alpha(\theta) = |\theta|^\alpha[1 - \mathrm{i}\tan(\pi\alpha/2)\mathrm{sgn}(\theta)\mathbf{1}\{\alpha \neq 1\} + \mathrm{i}(2/\pi)\mathrm{sgn}(\theta)\ln|\theta|\mathbf{1}\{\alpha = 1\}]$. Conversely, for any $C > 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and ξ on S^{d-1}, provided $\mathbb{E}\xi = 0$ if $\alpha = 1$, the RHS is the characteristic function of a nonconstant strictly stable distribution.

Proposition 2.7. *If ξ has a bounded density with respect to the spherical measure on S^{d-1}, then (1.6) holds for G, i.e., $\sup|\varrho_\delta - \varrho_0| \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$.*

Proof. Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ be independent of ξ with $\varphi_Y(\theta) = e^{-Cf_\alpha(\theta)}$. As mentioned just now, such Y exists and is strictly stable. Let $X = Y\xi$. Then $q_X(s) = q_Y(s) \asymp s^{-\alpha}$ for $s \gg 1$. For $\Gamma \subset S^{d-1}$, $\mathbb{P}\{|X| > s,\, X/|X| \in \Gamma\} = \mathbb{P}\{Y > s\}\mathbb{P}\{\xi \in \Gamma\} + \mathbb{P}\{Y < -s\}\mathbb{P}\{\xi \in -\Gamma\}$, so by $\mathbb{P}\{Y < -s\} \leq \mathbb{E}e^{-s-Y} \ll e^{-s}$ [17, Theorem 25.17],

$$\mathbb{P}\{|X| > s,\, X/|X| \in \Gamma\}/q_X(s) \to \mathbb{P}\{\xi \in \Gamma\}, \quad s \to \infty.$$

Then X is in the domain of attraction of a stable law with the same Lévy measure as G, with $a_n \propto n^{1/\alpha}$ being norming constant [16, Theorem 4.2]. By $Y \in \mathcal{D}_0'(\alpha)$ and (1.9), $(n/a_n)c_X(a_n) = (n/a_n)c_Y(a_n)\mathbb{E}(\xi)$ converges, so by (1.9) again, $S_n(X)/a_n$ weakly converges to a strictly stable law. Since G is strictly stable, if $\alpha \neq 1$, then the limiting law is G. However, if $\alpha = 1$, then the limiting law is $G(x - x_0)$, where x_0 need not be 0. Let g be the density of Y. Since g is unimodal [24], $g(x) \ll |x|^{-\alpha-1}$ [1, Theorem 1.7.2]. Let λ be the density of ξ with respect to the spherical measure σ on S^{d-1}. Then for $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\{X \in E\} &= \int \mathbf{1}\{yu \in E\}g(y)\lambda(u)\mathrm{d}y\,\sigma(\mathrm{d}u)\\ &= \int_{r>0} \mathbf{1}\{ru \in E\}[g(r)\lambda(u) + g(-r)\lambda(-u)]\mathrm{d}y\,\sigma(\mathrm{d}u).\end{aligned}$$

For $x = ru \neq 0$ with $r = |x|$, letting $h(x) = c[g(r)\lambda(u) + g(-r)\lambda(-u)]/r^{d-1}$ with $c > 0$ a suitable constant, the last integral is equal to $\int \mathbf{1}\{x \in E\}h(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$, showing that X has density h. Since $\sup_u[r^d h(ru)/q_X(r)] \ll (\sup \lambda)r^{1+\alpha}[g(r) + g(-r)] \ll 1$, it is seen $\omega(x)$ defined in Proposition 2.3 is bounded and hence (1.6) holds for the limiting law of $S_n(X)/a_n$. For $\alpha \neq 1$, this completes the proof. If $\alpha = 1$, one can only conclude that (1.6) holds for $G(x - x_0)$. However, consider $X + x_0$, whose corresponding limiting law is G. Since $|x|^d\mathbb{P}\{X + x_0 \in x + hI_d\}A(|x|) \ll |x_0|^d A(|x_0|) + |x - x_0|^d\mathbb{P}\{X \in x - x_0 + hI_d\}A(|x - x_0|)$ is bounded, a repeat of argument shows that (1.6) holds for G. □

The last application is on the SRT for an infinitely divisible (ID) distribution. There has been a tradition in probability theory to infer properties of an ID distribution from its Lévy measure [1, 8.2.7; 10, XVII.4; 8]. The next result is along the lines of the tradition.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$. Suppose $F \in \mathcal{D}'_0(\alpha)$ is ID with Lévy measure ν. Define $A_\nu(s) = 1/\nu(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus sB_d)$ and $\omega_\nu(x) = |x|^d\nu(x + hI_d)A_\nu(|x|)$. If condition (2.5) is satisfied with ω and A being replaced with ω_ν and A_ν, then the SRT holds for F.*

Proof. It suffices to show that $X \sim F$ satisfies (1.4). Part of the argument is similar to that in [3], so only parts that are different will be shown in detail. First, the support of ν is unbounded, otherwise $\mathbb{E}e^{|tX|} < \infty$ for all t and $F \in \mathcal{D}'_0(2)$ [17, Theorem 25.17]. Let $\nu_1(\cdot) = \nu(\cdot \setminus B_d)$ and $\lambda = \nu - \nu_1$. Let $\mu = \nu_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then $S_n(X) \sim S_{S_n(N)}(Z) + S_n(W) + nv$, where N_i, Z_j and W_k are independent with N_i i.i.d. $\sim$ Poisson(μ), Z_j i.i.d. $\sim \nu_1/\mu$, and W_k i.i.d., ID with Lévy measure λ and mean 0, and $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a constant. Fix $M > 1 \vee (4\mu)^{1/\alpha}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Let $Y = Z + v/\mu$ and G the distribution of Y. Let $V = W + v - Nv/\mu$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} F^{*n}(s\omega + hI_d) &= \mathbb{P}\{S_{S_n(N)}(Y) + S_n(V) \in s\omega + hI_d\} \\ &\leq \sup_{|t|<\epsilon s} \mathbb{P}\{S_{S_n(N)}(Y) \in s\omega - t + hI_d\} + \mathbb{P}\{|S_n(V)| \geq \epsilon s\} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \leq A(M\delta s)} \mathbb{P}\{S_n(N) = k\} \sup_{|y|>(1-\epsilon)s} G^{*k}(y + hI_d) + R_n(s) + R'_n(s), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_n(s) = \mathbb{P}\{S_n(N) > A(M\delta s)\}$, $R'_n(s) = \mathbb{P}\{|S_n(V)| > \epsilon s\}$. It can be shown that

$$\sum_{n \leq A(\delta s)} F^{*n}(s\omega + hI_d) \ll \sum_{k \leq A(M\delta s)} \sup_{|y|>(1-\epsilon)s} G^{*k}(y + hI_d) + \sum_{n \leq A(\delta s)} [R_n(s) + R'_n(s)].$$

As in [3], $\sum_{n \leq A(\delta s)} R_n(s) = o(A(s)/s^d)$ as $s \to \infty$. Let $V = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_d)$. Then $R'_n(s) \leq \sum_{j=1}^d R'_{nj}(s)$, where $R'_{nj}(s) = \mathbb{P}\{|S_n(\xi_j)| > \epsilon s/d\}$. Each $\xi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ has mean zero and $\mathbb{E}e^{t\xi_j} < \infty$ for all t. Fix $b \in (0, \alpha \wedge 1)$. For $s \gg_b 1/\delta$ and $n \leq A(\delta s)$, if $1 \leq n \leq s^b$, then

$$\begin{aligned} R'_{nj}(s) &= \mathbb{P}\{S_n(\xi_j) > \epsilon s/d\} + \mathbb{P}\{-S_n(\xi_j) > \epsilon s/d\} \\ &\leq [(\mathbb{E}e^{\xi_j})^n + (\mathbb{E}e^{-\xi_j})^n]e^{-\epsilon s/d} = O(1)^n e^{-\epsilon s/d} \ll e^{-\epsilon s/2d}. \end{aligned}$$

If $s^b < n < A(\delta s)$, then, letting $\sigma_j^2 = \mathbb{E}[\xi_j^2]$ and $\sigma = \max \sigma_j$,

$$\epsilon s/(d\sigma\sqrt{n}) \geq (\epsilon/\delta)A^{-1}(n)/(d\sigma\sqrt{n}) \geq \eta n^c$$

for some constants $\eta > 0$ and $0 < c < 1/6$. By Cramér's large deviation [15, Theorem 5.23], $R'_{nj}(s) \leq \mathbb{P}\{|S_n(\xi_j)|/(\sigma_j\sqrt{n}) > \epsilon s/(d\sigma\sqrt{n})\} \ll 1 - \Phi(\eta n^c) \leq 1 - \Phi(\eta s^{bc})$, where Φ is the distribution function of $N(0, 1)$. It is then easy to get $\sum_{n \leq A(\delta s)} R'_n(s) = o(A(s)/s^d)$.

Since $N_n/n \xrightarrow{D} \mu$ and $S_n(V)/a_n \xrightarrow{D} 0$, by $S_n(X)/a_n \sim S_{N_n}(Y)/a_n + S_n(V)/a_n$, it can be seen that $\mu^{1/\alpha}Y$ is in the domain of attraction without centering of the same stable law as X. By the assumption on $\omega_\nu(x)$, Theorem 1.5 and Proposition 2.3,

$$\sum_{k \le A(M\delta s)} \sup_{|y|>(1-\epsilon)s} G^{*k}(y + hI_d) \ll_h \delta A_\nu(s)/s^d.$$

By following almost line by line the argument in [10], p. 572–573, $q_X(s) \sim 1/A_\nu(s)$. Then $A(s) \sim A_\nu(s)$ and the proof is complete. □

3 Lévy concentration function

For any random variable $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define

$$Q_X(h) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{P}\{X \in x + hI_d\}, \quad h \ge 0.$$

The function is a special case of Lévy concentration function of multivariate random variables, which has been studied before [13, 25]. However, for our purpose, we need

Lemma 3.1. *There is an absolute constant $c_d > 0$, such that*

$$Q_X(h) \le c_d[(1/a) \vee h]^d \int_{\|t\| \le a} |\varphi_X(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t, \quad a > 0.$$

Proof. We follow the argument in [15], p. 22–26. Let f be a probability density on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $f(x) = f(-x)$ and $\widehat{f} \in L^1$. For $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $a > 0$, by applying Fourier inversion formula to the density of $X + a^{-1}Y$, where Y has density f and is independent of X,

$$\begin{aligned}\int f(ax)\,\mathbb{P}\{X \in y + \mathrm{d}x\} &= \frac{1}{(2\pi a)^d} \int e^{\mathrm{i}\langle t, y\rangle} \widehat{f}(t/a)\varphi_X(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\le \frac{1}{(2\pi a)^d} \int |\widehat{f}(t/a)\varphi_X(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\int f(ax)\mathbb{P}\{X \in y + \mathrm{d}x\} &\ge \int_{\|x\| \le h/2} f(ax)\mathbb{P}\{X \in y + \mathrm{d}x\} \\ &\ge \inf_{\|x\| \le ah/2} f(x) \cdot \mathbb{P}\{X \in y + [-h/2, h/2]^d\}.\end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$Q_X(h) \le (2\pi a)^{-d} \sup_{\|x\| \le ah/2} \frac{1}{f(x)} \int |\widehat{f}(t/a)\varphi_X(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t. \tag{3.1}$$

Now for $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d)$, let $f(x) = \prod f_0(x_i)$, where $f_0(y) = 3/(8\pi)[\sin(y/4)/(y/4)]^4$ for $y \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and $f_0(0) = 3/(8\pi)$. Then for $t = (t_1, \ldots, t_d)$, $\widehat{f}(t) = \prod \widehat{f_0}(t_i)$, where

$$\widehat{f_0}(t_i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |t_i| \ge 1, \\ 2(1 - |t_i|)^3 & \text{if } |t_i| \in [1/2, 1] \\ 1 - 6t_i^2 + 6|t_i|^3 & \text{if } |t_i| \le 1/2. \end{cases}$$

See p. 25 [15]. Let $c_d = (2\pi)^{-d} \sup_{\|x\| \le 1/2} 1/f(x)$. Then by (3.1), for $a \le 1/h$,

$$Q_X(h) \le c_d (1/a)^d \int_{\|t\| \le a} |\varphi_X(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t.$$

On the other hand, for $a \ge 1/h$

$$c_d h^d \int_{\|t\| \le a} |\varphi_X(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t \ge c_d h^d \int_{\|t\| \le 1/h} |\varphi_X(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t \ge Q_X(h),$$

where the second inequality follows from the previous display. Combining the two displays then finishes the proof. □

4 Local large deviation bound

Proposition 4.1. *Let $F \in \mathcal{D}_0'(\alpha)$ and $X, X_1, X_2, \ldots$ be i.i.d. $\sim F$. Put $|X_{0:1}| = 0$ and for $n \ge 1$, put $|X_{n:1}| = |X_{n-1:1}| \vee |X_n|$. Then there are $s_0 > 0$, $C > 0$ both only depending on $\{F, A\}$, such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $s \ge s_0$, $h > 0$, and $n \ge 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in x + hI_d, \, |X_{n:1}| \le s\} \ll_h (s^{-d} + a_n^{-d}) e^{-|x|/s + Cn/A(s)}.$$

In particular, letting $s = \infty$ yields $Q_{S_n(X)}(h) \ll_h a_n^{-d}$.

The result is a multivariate generalization of the local large deviation bounds in [3, 5, 7]. We will also use the following consequence of Proposition 4.1.

Corollary 4.2. *Under the same assumption as in Proposition 4.1, there are $\chi > 0$, $C > 0$ both only depending on $\{F, A\}$, such that for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $s \ge 1$, $h > 0$, and $n \ge 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in x + hI_d, \, |X_{n:1}| \le s\} \ll_h (s^{-d} + a_n^{-d}) e^{-\chi|x|/s + Cn/A(s)}.$$

Proof. Let s_0 and C be as in Proposition 4.1 and $\chi = (1/s_0) \wedge 1$. Then the proof follows by noting that for $1 \le s < s_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in x + hI_d, \, |X_{n:1}| \le s\} &\le \mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in x + hI_d, \, |X_{n:1}| \le s_0\} \\
&\ll_h (s_0^{-d} + a_n^{-d}) e^{-|x|/s_0 + Cn/A(s_0)} \\
&\le (s^{-d} + a_n^{-d}) e^{-\chi|x|/s + Cn/A(s)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The case $n = 0$ is included in Proposition 4.1 only for convenience, which follows by noting $\mathbb{P}\{S_0(X) \in x + hI_d, \, |X_{0:1}| \le s\} = \mathbf{1}\{-x \in hI_d\} \le \mathbf{1}\{|x| \le h\sqrt{d}\}$. Let $n \ge 1$ henceforth. We need several lemmas which will be shown later. We start with

Lemma 4.3. *There is $s_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{\omega \in S^{d-1}} \mathbb{E}[\langle \omega, X_1 - X_2 \rangle^2 \mathbf{1}\{|X_1| \vee |X_2| \le s_0/(2\sqrt{d})\}] > 0.$$

Fix $s_0 > 0$ as in the lemma. Then for $\omega \in S^{d-1}$ and $s \ge s_0$,

$$Z(s, \omega) := \mathbb{E}[e^{\langle \omega, X \rangle / s} \mathbf{1}\{|X| \le s\}] \in (0, e).$$

Define the following probability measure concentrated in sB_d,

$$G_{s,\omega}(\mathrm{d}x) = Z(s,\omega)^{-1} e^{\langle \omega, x\rangle/s} \mathbf{1}\{|x| \le s\} F(\mathrm{d}x).$$

Let $x = rv$, where $r = |x|$ and $v \in S^{d-1}$. Let $Y, Y_1, Y_2, \dots$ be i.i.d. $\sim G_{s,v}$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in x + hI_d,\ |X_{n:1}| \le s\} = [Z(s,v)]^n \mathbb{E}[e^{-\langle v, S_n(Y)\rangle/s} \mathbf{1}\{S_n(Y) \in x + hI_d\}].$$

Since $\langle v, y\rangle - \langle v, x\rangle \ge -|y - x| \ge -\sqrt{d}h$ for $y \in x + hI_d$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\langle v, S_n(Y)\rangle/s} \mathbf{1}\{S_n(Y) \in x + hI_d\} &\ll_h e^{-\langle v, x\rangle/s} \mathbf{1}\{S_n(Y) \in x + hI_d\} \\ &= e^{-r/s} \mathbf{1}\{S_n(Y) \in x + hI_d\}, \quad s \ge s_0. \end{aligned}$$

We now need

Lemma 4.4. *$[\ln Z(s,\omega)]_+ \ll 1/A(s)$ for $s \ge s_0$ and $\omega \in S^{d-1}$.*

It follows that there is a constant $C = C(F, A) > 0$ such that $\ln Z(s,\omega) \le C/A(s)$ for $s \ge s_0$ and $\omega \in S^{d-1}$. This combined with last two displays leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in x + hI_d,\ |X_{n:1}| \le s\} &\le [Z(s,v)]^n e^{-r/s} \mathbb{P}\{S_n(Y) \in x + hI_d\} \\ &\le [Z(s,v)]^n e^{-r/s} Q_{S_n(Y)}(h) \\ &\ll e^{-r/s + Cn/A(s)} Q_{S_n(Y)}(h). \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

By Lemma 3.1, if $W = Y_1 - Y_2$, then $\varphi_W(t) = |\varphi_Y(t)|^2 > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{S_n(Y)}(h) &\le c_d (s_0 \vee h)^d \int_{\|t\| \le 1/s_0} |\varphi_{S_n(Y)}(t)|\, \mathrm{d}t \\ &\ll_h \int_{\|t\| \le 1/s_0} \varphi_W(t)^{n/2}\, \mathrm{d}t \\ &\ll_h s^{-d} + \int_{1/s < |t| \le \sqrt{d}/s_0} \varphi_W(t)^{n/2}\, \mathrm{d}t. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

By $x \le e^{-(1-x)}$, $\varphi_W(t) = \mathbb{E}\cos\langle t, W\rangle \le e^{-(1 - \mathbb{E}\cos\langle t, W\rangle)/2}$. By $1 - \cos x \gg x^2$ for $|x| \le 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &1 - \mathbb{E}\cos\langle t, W\rangle \\ &\ge \mathbb{E}[(1 - \cos\langle t, W\rangle)\mathbf{1}\{|\langle t, W\rangle| \le 1\}] \\ &\gg \mathbb{E}[\langle t, Y_1 - Y_2\rangle^2 \mathbf{1}\{|\langle t, Y_i\rangle| \le 1/2,\ i = 1, 2\}] \\ &= Z(s,v)^{-2} \mathbb{E}[\langle t, X_1 - X_2\rangle^2 e^{\langle v, X_1 + X_2\rangle/s} \mathbf{1}\{|\langle t, X_i\rangle| \le 1/2,\ |X_i| \le s,\ i = 1, 2\}]. \end{aligned}$$

Given $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $1/s < |t| \le \sqrt{d}/s_0$, let $\omega = t/|t|$ and $L = |t|^{-1}/2$. Then

$$1 - \mathbb{E}\cos\langle t, W\rangle \gg |t|^2 \mathbb{E}[\langle \omega, X_1 - X_2\rangle^2 \mathbf{1}\{|X_i| \le L,\ i = 1, 2\}]. \tag{4.3}$$

Since X_1 and X_2 are i.i.d. $\sim X$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \omega, X_1 - X_2\rangle^2 \mathbf{1}\{|X_i| \le L\}] = 2 m_X(L, \omega) \mathbb{P}\{|X| \le L\} - 2|\langle \omega, c_X(L)\rangle|^2.$$

Since $L \ge s_0/(2\sqrt{d})$, by Lemma 4.3, the infimum of the LHS over $\omega \in S^{d-1}$ is positive. In particular $m_X(L, \omega) \ge \inf_{\omega \in S^{d-1},\, s \ge s_0/(2\sqrt{d})} m_X(s, \omega) > 0$. To continue, we need

Lemma 4.5. *$m_X(s,\omega) \asymp s^2/A(s)$ for $s \ge s_0$ and $\omega \in S^{d-1}$.*

It follows that $m_X(L,\omega)\mathbb{P}\{|X| \le L\} \asymp |t|^{-2}/A(1/|t|)$ for $|t| \le \sqrt{d}/s_0$ with $L = |t|^{-1}/2$. On the other hand, by (1.9), $|\langle \omega, c_X(L)\rangle|^2 \le |c_X(L)|^2 \ll |t|^{-2}/A(1/|t|)^2$. This combined with last two displays yields that, for $1/s < |t| \le \sqrt{d}/s_0$, $1 - \mathbb{E}\cos\langle t, W\rangle \gg 1/A(1/|t|)$, and so for some $c > 0$ that only depends on $\{F, A\}$, $\varphi_W(t) \le \exp\{-2c/A(1/|t|)\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{1/s<|t|\le\sqrt{d}/s_0} \varphi_W(t)^{n/2}\,\mathrm{d}t &\le \int_{1/s<|t|\le\sqrt{d}/s_0} \exp\left\{-\frac{cn}{A(1/|t|)}\right\}\mathrm{d}t \\ &\ll \int_{1/s}^{\sqrt{d}/s_0} y^{d-1}\exp\left\{-\frac{cA(a_n)}{A(1/y)}\right\}\mathrm{d}y.\end{aligned}$$

By Potter's Theorem [1, Th. 1.5.6], $A(a_n)/A(1/y) \gg (a_n y)^{\alpha/2} \wedge (a_n y)^{3\alpha/2}$ for $n \ge 1$ and $y \le \sqrt{d}/s_0$. Combining with the above display and $e^{-(x\wedge y)} \le e^{-x} + e^{-y}$, there is $C = C(F,A) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{1/s<|t|\le\sqrt{d}/s_0} \varphi_W(t)^{n/2}\,\mathrm{d}t \ll \int_{1/s}^{\sqrt{d}/s_0} y^{d-1}(e^{-C(a_n y)^{\alpha/2}} + e^{-C(a_n y)^{3\alpha/2}})\,\mathrm{d}y.$$

On the other hand, for any $b > 0$ and $q > 0$,

$$\int_{1/s}^{\infty} y^{d-1}e^{-b(a_n y)^q}\,\mathrm{d}y = a_n^{-d}\int_{a_n/s}^{\infty} y^{d-1}e^{-by^q}\,\mathrm{d}y \ll_{b,q} a_n^{-d}.$$

The above three displays combined with (4.1) and (4.2) then prove Proposition 4.1.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Put $\mu(\omega,s) = \mathbb{E}[\langle\omega, X_1 - X_2\rangle^2 \mathbf{1}\{|X_1|\vee|X_2| \le s/2\}]$. Since $F \in \mathcal{D}_0'(\alpha)$ is nondegenerate, for each $\omega \in S^{d-1}$, $\mu(\omega,\infty) > 0$, so by monotone convergence, there is $s(\omega) > 0$ with $\mu(\omega, s(\omega)) > 0$. Then by continuity of the mapping $v \to \mu(v, s(\omega))$, there is $r(\omega) > 0$, such that $\mu(v, s(\omega)) \ge \mu(\omega, s(\omega))/2$ for $v \in [\omega + r(\omega)B_d] \cap S^{d-1}$. Since S^{d-1} is compact, there are $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n \in S^{d-1}$, such that S^{d-1} is covered by the union of $\omega_i + r(\omega_i)B_d$. Then it is easy to see that $s_0 = \max_i s(\omega_i)$ has the asserted property. □

Proof of Lemma 4.4. By $Z(s,\omega) = \mathbb{E}[e^{\langle\omega,X\rangle/s}\mathbf{1}\{|X| \le s\}]$ and $\ln x \le x - 1$ for $x > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\ln Z(s,\omega) &\le \mathbb{E}[e^{\langle\omega,X\rangle/s}\mathbf{1}\{|X| \le s\}] - 1 \\ &\le \mathbb{E}[(e^{\langle\omega,X\rangle/s} - 1)\mathbf{1}\{|X| \le s\}] \\ &= I(s,\omega) + \langle\omega, s^{-1}c_X(s)\rangle, \qquad (4.4)\end{aligned}$$

where $I(s,\omega) = \mathbb{E}[(e^{\langle\omega,X\rangle/s} - 1 - \langle\omega,X\rangle/s)\mathbf{1}\{|X| \le s\}]$. By $|e^z - 1 - z| \le cz^2$ for $|z| \le 1$, where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant, for $s \ge s_0$, $|I(s,\omega)| \ll s^{-2}m_X(s,\omega) \le s^{-2}V_X(s) = [1 + o(1)]/A(s)$. On the other hand, from (1.9), $\sup_{\omega\in S^{d-1}}|\langle\omega, s^{-1}c_X(s)\rangle| \ll 1/A(s)$. Then by (4.4), the proof is complete. □

Proof of Lemma 4.5. Since for all $s \ge s_0$ and $\omega \in S^{d-1}$, $0 < m_X(s,\omega) \le V_X(s) \asymp s^2/A(s)$, it suffices to show that for $s \ge s_0$, $\inf_{\omega\in S^{d-1}} m_X(s,\omega) \gg s^2/A(s)$. For $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in S^{d-1}$, by $|\langle\omega_1,X\rangle^2 - \langle\omega_2,X\rangle^2| \le 2|\omega_1 - \omega_2||X|^2$, $|m_X(s,\omega_1) - m_X(s,\omega_2)| \le 2|\omega_1 - \omega_2|V_X(s)$. Then, by the compactness of S^{d-1}, it suffices to show that given $\omega \in S^{d-1}$, for $s \ge s_0$,

$m_X(s,\omega) \gg s^2/A(s)$. As mentioned earlier, when $\alpha = 2$, the inequality follows from Theorem 4.1 of [16]. Let $\alpha \in (0,2)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} m_X(s,\omega) &= \int_{z\in[0,x],\, v\in S^{d-1}} z^2\langle\omega,v\rangle^2 \mathbb{P}\{|X| \in \mathrm{d}z,\ X/|X| \in \mathrm{d}v\} \\ &= 2\int_{z\in[0,s],\, v\in S^{d-1}} \langle\omega,v\rangle^2 \left(\int_0^z x\,\mathrm{d}x\right) \mathbb{P}\{|X| \in \mathrm{d}z,\ X/|X| \in \mathrm{d}v\} \\ &= 2\int_{x\in[0,s],\, v\in S^{d-1}} \langle\omega,v\rangle^2 x\mathbb{P}\{x \le |X| \le s,\ X/|X| \in \mathrm{d}v\}\,\mathrm{d}x \end{aligned}$$

Let $s \to \infty$. By Theorem 4.2 of [16] and Theorem 14.10 of [17], there is a finite nonzero measure H on S^{d-1}, such that for any measurable $E \subset S^{d-1}$, $\mathbb{P}\{|X| \ge s,\ X/|X| \in E\}/q_X(s) \to H(E)/H(S^{d-1})$. Then standard argument based on Riemann sum approximation to the integral over $v \in S^{d-1}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} m_X(s,\omega) &= 2\left[\int \langle\omega,v\rangle^2 H(\mathrm{d}v) + o(1)\right] \int_0^s x[q_X(x) - q_X(s)]\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \frac{[c+o(1)]s^2}{(2-\alpha)A(s)} \left[\int \langle\omega,v\rangle^2 H(\mathrm{d}v) + o(1)\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $c = c(F,A) > 0$ is a constant. Since the limiting stable law of $S_n(X)/a_n$ is nondegenerate, by Lemma 3.1 of [16], $\int\langle\omega,v\rangle^2 H(\mathrm{d}v) > 0$. Then the proof is complete. □

5 Local limit theorem

We shall first prove Proposition 1.1. For a set E in a Euclidean space, denote by $\mathrm{span}(E)$ the linear subspace spanned by elements of E. If M is a matrix, denote by $\mathrm{csp}(M)$ its column space, i.e., the linear subspace spanned by the column vectors of M. If the rank of M is equal to its number of columns, then M is said to be of full column rank.

Proof of Proposition 1.1. The first step is to show that the set

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &= \{v \in \mathbb{R}^d : \text{there is } a \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } \langle v, X\rangle \in a + \mathbb{Z} \text{ a.s.}\} \\ &= \{v \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\varphi_X(2\pi v)| = 1\} \end{aligned}$$

is a lattice. The first line in the display implies that Γ is an additive subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Therefore it suffices to show that 0 is not a cluster point of Γ. Let $u_n \in \Gamma$ such that $u_n \to 0$. Let $V_n = \mathrm{span}(u_i,\ i \ge n)$. Since $\mathbb{R}^d \supset V_1 \supset V_2 \supset \ldots$, there is k, such that $V_k = V_{k+1} = \cdots$. Let X_* be i.i.d. $\sim X$ and $\xi = X - X_*$. Then almost surely, $\langle u_n, \xi\rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all n. Since $\langle u_n,\xi\rangle \to 0$, this implies that for n large enough, in particular, $n \ge k$, we have $\langle u_n,\xi\rangle = 0$, i.e., $\xi \perp u_n$. But then $\xi \in V_n^\perp = V_k^\perp$. By assumption, ξ is not concentrated in any linear subspace of dimension $d-1$. As a result, $V_k = \{0\}$, giving $u_k = u_{k+1} = \cdots = 0$. This shows 0 is not a cluster point of Γ.

Let $V = \mathrm{span}(\Gamma)$ and $r = \dim(V)$. Suppose $r \ge 1$. By a fundamental theorem of lattices [20, Lemma 3.4], there is $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times r}$ of full column rank, such that $\Gamma = M\mathbb{Z}^r$. Then $V = \mathrm{csp}(M)$. Denote by $v_1,\ldots,v_r$ the column vectors of M. Fix $a = (a_1,\ldots,a_r)$, such that $\langle v_i, X\rangle \in a_i + \mathbb{Z}$, $1 \le i \le r$. Then

$$X \in \Lambda = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : M'x - a \in \mathbb{Z}^r\}.$$

Let $H = M(M'M)^{-1}$. For $y \in \mathbb{R}^r$, $M'x = y \iff M'(x - Hy) = 0$, i.e., $x - Hy \in V^\perp$. Then $x \in \Lambda \iff x = H(a + k) + z$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ and $z \in V^\perp$, so by $H\mathbb{R}^r \subset V$,

$$\Lambda = [H(a + \mathbb{Z}^r)] \oplus V^\perp.$$

As a result, $\pi_V(X) \in \pi_V(\Lambda) = H(a + \mathbb{Z}^r) \subset V$, so $\pi_V(X)$ is lattice. If $v \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus V$, then by $\Gamma \subset V$, $v \notin \Gamma$ and so $|\varphi_X(2\pi v)| < 1$. Thus V has the property stated in the proposition.

Let $S \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ such that $SHf_i = e_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$ and $SV^\perp = \operatorname{span}(e_{r+1}, \ldots, e_d)$, where f_i are the standard base vectors of $\mathbb{R}^r$, and e_j those of $\mathbb{R}^d$. In matrix form,

$$SH = \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id}_r \\ O \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times r}, \quad S(I - HM') = \begin{pmatrix} O \\ Q' \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d} \tag{5.1}$$

where $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times(d-r)}$ is of full column rank. Let $SX = (\zeta, Z) \in \mathbb{R}^r \times \mathbb{R}^{d-r}$. Then ζ is concentrated on $SH(a + \mathbb{Z}^r) = y + \mathbb{Z}^r$, where $y = SHa$. We need the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^r$, there is $K \in \mathbb{Z}^{r\times r}$ with $\det K = \pm 1$, such that $Ky = (0, \ldots, 0, z_\nu, z_{\nu+1}, \ldots, z_r)$, where $z_\nu \in [0, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ and $z_{\nu+1}, \ldots, z_r \in (0, \infty) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ are rationally independent.*

Let

$$K_1 = \begin{pmatrix} K & O \\ O & I \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = K_1 S, \quad \beta_i = z_i - \lfloor z_i \rfloor, \ i = \nu, \ldots, r$$

and $\beta = (0, \ldots, 0, \beta_\nu, \beta_{\nu+1}, \ldots, \beta_r)$. Then $TX = (Y, Z)$, where $Y = K\zeta$, $\beta_\nu \in \mathbb{Q} \in [0, 1)$, and $\beta_{\nu+1}, \ldots, \beta_r \in (0, 1) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ are rationally independent. Since $K\mathbb{Z}^r = \mathbb{Z}^r$, Y is concentrated on $K\gamma + K\mathbb{Z}^r = \beta + \mathbb{Z}^r$.

To show T has the property stated in the proposition, first, if $u = (k, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^r \times \{0\}$, then by $\langle u, TX\rangle = \langle k, Y\rangle \in \langle k, \beta\rangle + \mathbb{Z}$, $|\varphi_{TX}(2\pi u)| = 1$. Conversely, if $|\varphi_{TX}(2\pi u)| = 1$, then $|\varphi_X(2\pi T'u)| = 1$, giving $T'u = Mk \in \Gamma$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}^r$. Write $u = (w, v)$ with $w \in \mathbb{R}^r$. By (5.1), $H'T'u = H'S'K_1'u = K'w$. Meanwhile, the LHS is $H'Mk = k$. Then $K'w = k$, giving $w = (K')^{-1}k \in \mathbb{Z}^r$. On the other hand, by (5.1), $(I - MH')T'u = (I - MH')S'K_1'u = Qv$ and the LHS is also equal to $(I - MH')Mk = 0$. Thus $Qv = 0$. Since Q is of full column rank, $v = 0$ and hence $u = (w, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^r \times \{0\}$.

So far we have assumed $r = \dim(V) > 0$. If $r = 0$, then $\Gamma = V = \{0\}$. Consequently, $|\varphi_X(2\pi v)| < 1$ for $v \neq 0$ and $T = \mathrm{Id}_d$ has the property stated in the proposition.

To show that V is unique, let W be a linear subspace such that $\pi_W(X)$ is lattice and $|\varphi_X(2\pi v)| < 1$ for $v \notin W$. By definition, $\Gamma \subset W$, so $V = \operatorname{span}(\Gamma) \subset W$. If $V \neq W$, then $W \cap V^\perp \neq \emptyset$ and $\pi_{W\cap V^\perp}(X) = \pi_{W\cap V^\perp}(\pi_W(X))$ is lattice. It follows that there is $0 \neq u \in W \cap V^\perp$, such that $\langle u, X\rangle = \langle u, \pi_{W\cap V^\perp}(X)\rangle \in a + \mathbb{Z}$ for some a. But then $u \in \Gamma \subset V$. The contradiction shows $V = W$ and hence the uniqueness of V.

To show that ν, r, and q are unique, let $0 \le \mu \le s \le d$, $q_* \in \mathbb{N}$, and $S \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ be nonsingular, such that

$$|\varphi_{SX}(2\pi u)| = 1 \iff u \in \mathbb{Z}^s \times \{0\}, \tag{5.2}$$

and writing $SX = (Y_*, Z_*)$ with $Y_* \in \mathbb{R}^s$ and $Z^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d-s}$, $\mathbb{P}\{Y_* \in \gamma + \mathbb{Z}^s\} = 1$ for $\gamma = (0, \ldots, 0, \gamma_\mu, \gamma_{\mu+1}, \ldots, \gamma_s)$, where $\gamma_\mu = p_*/q_*$ with $0 \le p_* < q_*$ being coprime, and $\gamma_{\nu+1}, \ldots, \gamma_s \in (0, 1) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ are rationally independent. Since $S'u \in \Gamma \iff |\varphi_{SX}(2\pi u)| = 1$,

by (5.2), $\Gamma = S'(\mathbb{Z}^s \times \{0\})$. Since S is nonsingular, by comparing the dimensions of the spanned linear spaces, $s = \dim(V) = r$.

Let $r > 0$, otherwise the uniqueness of $\nu = 0$ and $q = 1$ is immediate. Now that $T'(\mathbb{Z}^r \times \{0\}) = S'(\mathbb{Z}^r \times \{0\})$, $T_1'\mathbb{Z}^r = S_1'\mathbb{Z}^r$, where $T_1, S_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times d}$ consist of the first r rows of T and S, respectively. Then there are $J, J_* \in \mathbb{Z}^{r\times r}$, such that $T_1 = JS_1$ and $J_*T_1 = S_1$, giving $J_*JS_1 = J_*T_1 = S_1$. Since the rows of S_1 are linearly independent, $J_*J = \mathrm{Id}_r$. Thus $J^{-1} = J_*$. On the other hand, $S_1X = Y_*$. Then $T_1X = JS_1X = JY_* \in J(\gamma + \mathbb{Z}^r) = J\gamma + J\mathbb{Z}^r = J\gamma + \mathbb{Z}^r$. Since $T_1X \in \beta + \mathbb{Z}^r$, then $\beta - J\gamma = (b_1, \ldots, b_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$. Let $J = (g_{ij})$. Each $\beta_i = c_i + g_{i,\mu+1}\gamma_{\mu+1} + \ldots + g_{ir}\gamma_r$, with $c_i = b_i + g_{i1}\gamma_1 + \ldots + g_{i\mu}\gamma_\mu = b_i + g_{i\mu}\gamma_\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since β_i, $i > \nu$, are rationally independent, this leads to $\mu \le \nu$. Likewise, $\nu \le \mu$. Thus $\mu = \nu$. If $\nu = 0$, then by definition, $q_* = q = 1$, proving the uniqueness of q. Let $\nu > 0$. Then for $i \le \nu$, $g_{i,\nu+1}\gamma_{\nu+1} + \cdots + g_{ir}\gamma_r = \beta_i - c_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. By rational independence of $\gamma_{\nu+1}, \ldots, \gamma_r$, $\beta_i = c_i$. In particular, $\beta_\nu = k\gamma_\nu - l$ with $k = g_{\nu\nu}$ and $l = -b_\nu$. Likewise, $\gamma_\nu = k_*\beta_\nu - l_*$ with $k_*, l_* \in \mathbb{Z}$. As a result $(kk_* - 1)\beta_\nu = k(\gamma_\nu + l_*) - \beta_\nu = l + kl_* \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $\beta_\nu = p/q$ with $0 \le p < q$ being coprime, $q \,|\, kk_* - 1$, so k_* and q are coprime. Then $\gamma_\nu = p_*/q$ with $p_* = k_*p - l_*q$ being coprime with q. Thus $q_* = q$, completing the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 5.1. The result is well known in elementary number theory. A proof is given here for convenience. For $k_1, \ldots, k_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, if at least one k_i is nonzero, then denote their greatest common divisor by $\gcd(k_1, \ldots, k_n) \in \mathbb{N}$, and if all $k_i \ne 0$, then denote their least common multiple by $\mathrm{lcm}(k_1, \ldots, k_n) \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_r) \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and, without loss of generality, let $y_1, \ldots, y_s \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $y_{s+1}, \ldots, y_r \notin \mathbb{Q}$, where $0 \le s \le r$. First, assume $s = r$. If there is at most one nonzero y_i, then by permuting and changing the signs of y_i, the claim follows. If, say $y_i = p_i/q_i \ne 0$, $i = 1, 2$, then let $p_i^* = p_i/\gcd(p_1, p_2)$ and $q_i^* = q_i/\gcd(q_1, q_2)$. Since $p_1^*q_2^*$ and $p_2^*q_1^*$ are coprime, there are $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $ap_1^*q_2^* + bp_2^*q_1^* = 1$. Let $G \in \mathbb{Z}^{\nu\times\nu}$ with $G_{11} = a$, $G_{12} = b$, $G_{21} = -p_2^*q_1^*$, $G_{22} = p_1^*q_2^*$, and all other $G_{ij} = \mathbf{1}\{i = j\}$. Then $\det G = 1$ and $Gy = \tilde{y}$ with $\tilde{y}_1 = \gcd(p_1, p_2)/\mathrm{lcm}(q_1, q_2) > 0$, $\tilde{y}_2 = 0$, and $\tilde{y}_i = y_i$ for $i \ge 3$. Now $\tilde{y}$ has one fewer nonzero coordinates than y. By induction, it is easy to see that there is $K \in \mathbb{Z}^{r\times r}$ with $\det K = 1$, such that Ky only has one nonzero coordinate, which is equal to $\gcd(p_1, \ldots, p_\nu)/\mathrm{lcm}(q_1, \ldots, q_\nu) > 0$. If necessary, permute the coordinates of Ky so that the last coordinate is nonzero. Then the claim follows.

Next, assume $s < r$. Denote $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_t)$ with $t = r - s$ and $z_i = y_{s+i}$. We show that there is $G \in \mathbb{Z}^{t\times t}$ with $\det G = \pm 1$, such that all the irrational coordinates of Gz are rationally independent. If all z_i are rationally independent, then $G = I$ suffices. Suppose, without loss of generality, $z_t = c_0 + c_1z_1 + \cdots + c_{t-1}z_{t-1}$, where $c_i \in \mathbb{Q}$. Write $x = (z_1, \ldots, z_{t-1})$. Then $z = c_0e_r + Mx$, where $M \in \mathbb{Q}^{t\times(t-1)}$ with $M_{ij} = \mathbf{1}\{i = j\}$ for $i, j < t$, and $M_{tj} = c_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, t-1$. From the case where $s = r$, there is $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{2\times 2}$ with $\det A = 1$, such that $Av = u$, where $v = (1, c_1) \in \mathbb{Q}^2$ and $u = (d_1, 0) \in \mathbb{Q}^2$. Let $L \in \mathbb{Z}^{t\times t}$, such that $L_{11} = A_{11}$, $L_{1t} = A_{12}$, $L_{t1} = A_{21}$, $L_{tt} = A_{22}$, and $L_{ij} = \mathbf{1}\{i = j\}$ for all other i, j. Then $\det L = \det A = 1$ and

$$LM = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & * \\ 0 & \tilde{M} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{Q}^{r\times(t-1)}$$

with $\tilde{M}_{ij} = \mathbf{1}\{i = j\}$ for $i, j < t - 1$. Apply the argument for M to $\tilde{M} \in \mathbb{Q}^{(t-1)\times(t-2)}$. By

induction, there is $H \in \mathbb{Z}^{t\times t}$ with $\det H = 1$, such that

$$HM = \begin{pmatrix} J \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{Q}^{t\times(t-1)},$$

with $J \in \mathbb{Q}^{(r-1)\times(r-1)}$ being upper triangular. Then by $Hz = Hc_0e_t + HMx$, the t^{th} coordinate of Hz belongs to $\mathbb{Q}$, and the other coordinates have at most $t-1$ irrational ones. Apply the argument for z to the vector of irrational coordinates of Hz. Then by induction, we get the desired G. Furthermore, by permuting and changing the signs of the coordinates if necessary, we can assume $Gz = (z_1, \dots, z_l, z_{l+1}, \dots, z_t)$ such that $z_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ for $i \le l$ and $z_{l+1}, \dots, z_r$ are positive and rationally independent.

Let $K \in \mathbb{Z}^{r\times r}$ with $K_{ij} = \mathbf{1}\{i = j\}$ for $i, j \le s$, and $K_{s+i,s+j} = G_{ij}$ for $i, j \le r-s$. It follows that the first $s+l$ coordinates of Ky are in $\mathbb{Q}$, and the rest are positive and rationally independent. Finally, applying the argument for the case where $s = r$ to the first $s+l$ coordinates of Ky, the proof is complete. □

The following statement on inverse Fourier transform will be used.

Lemma 5.2. *Fix $1 \le r < d$. Let $f(y,\cdot) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d-r})$ for each $y \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ and*

$$\sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^r} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-r}} |f(y,z)|\,\mathrm{d}z < \infty.$$

Define for $s \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}^{d-r}$,

$$\widehat{f}(s,t) = \sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^r} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-r}} f(y,z) e^{\mathrm{i}(\langle s,y\rangle + \langle t,z\rangle)}\,\mathrm{d}z.$$

If $\widehat{f} \in L^1([-\pi,\pi]^r \times \mathbb{R}^{d-r})$, then

$$f(y,z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{[-\pi,\pi]^r\times\mathbb{R}^{d-r}} \widehat{f}(s,t) e^{-\mathrm{i}(\langle s,y\rangle + \langle t,z\rangle)}\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Proof. Define $g(y,t) = \int f(y,z)e^{\mathrm{i}\langle t,z\rangle}\,\mathrm{d}z$. For each t, $\sum_y |g(y,t)| < \infty$ and $\widehat{f}(\cdot,t)$ is the discrete Fourier transform of $g(\cdot,t)$. Then by inverse discrete Fourier transform

$$g(y,t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^r} \int_{[-\pi,\pi]^r} \widehat{f}(s,t) e^{-\mathrm{i}\langle s,y\rangle}\,\mathrm{d}s, \quad y \in \mathbb{Z}^r,$$

which holds for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^{d-r}$. Given y, by $\widehat{f} \in L^1$, $g(y,\cdot) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d-r})$. Meanwhile, by definition, $g(y,\cdot)$ is the Fourier transform of $f(y,\cdot)$. Then by inverse Fourier transform,

$$f(y,z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d-r}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-}} g(y,t) e^{-\mathrm{i}\langle t,z\rangle}\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Combining the two displays and Fubini's theorem, the proof is complete. □

We now have the following generalization of the local limit theorems in [16] and [19].

Proposition 5.3. *Let $\xi = (Y, Z)$ be as in Proposition 1.1 and $\xi_i = (Y_i, Z_i)$, $i \geq 1$, be i.i.d. $\sim \xi$. Let $a_n \to \infty$ and $d_n = (b_n, c_n) \in \mathbb{R}^r \times \mathbb{R}^{d-r}$, such that $S_n(\xi)/a_n - d_n$ weakly converges to a stable law with density $\psi(y, z)$. Denote $\Lambda_n = (n\beta + \mathbb{Z}^r) \times \mathbb{R}^{d-r}$. Then as $n \to \infty$,*

$$\sup_{(y,z)\in\Lambda_n,\, h\leq 1} \left| a_n^d \mathbb{P}\{S_n(Y) = y,\, S_n(Z) \in z + hI_{d-r}\} - h^{d-r}\psi\left(\frac{y}{a_n} - b_n, \frac{z}{a_n} - c_n\right)\right| \to 0.$$

Proof. The proof is a rather straightforward combination of the proofs in [16, 19]. So only a sketch will be given. Let $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{d-r}$ with $\varphi_\zeta(t) = f(t) := \mathbf{1}\{\|t\| \leq 1\}\prod_i(1 - |t_i|)$ [cf. 19]. Let η be uniformly distributed on I_{d-r}, so that $\varphi_\eta(-t) = g(t) = \prod_{j=1}^{d-r} g_0(t_j)$ with $g_0(y) = (1 - e^{-\mathrm{i}y})/(\mathrm{i}y)$ for $y \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and $g_0(0) = 1$. Furthermore, let ζ, η, and ξ_i, $i \geq 1$, be independent. Given n, $h > 0$, and $\epsilon > 0$, define

$$V_{n,h,\epsilon}(y, z) = \mathbb{P}\{S_n(Y) = y,\, S_n(Z) + \epsilon\zeta \in z + hI_{d-r}\}.$$

Then $h^{-(d-r)}V_{n,h,\epsilon}(y, z)$ is the density of $(S_n(Y), S_n(Z) + \epsilon\zeta - h\eta)$ at (y, z) with respect to the product measure of the counting measure on $n\beta + \mathbb{Z}^r$ and the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{d-r}$. As a result,

$$\widehat{V}_{n,h,\epsilon}(s, t) = h^{d-r}\mathbb{E}e^{\mathrm{i}(\langle s, S_n(Y)\rangle + \langle t, S_n(Y) + \epsilon\zeta - h\eta\rangle)} = h^{d-r}[\varphi_\xi(s, t)]^n f(\epsilon t)g(ht),$$

Since $|\widehat{V}_{n,h,\epsilon}(s, t)| \leq h^{d-r}f(t) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d-r})$, $\widehat{V}_{n,h,\epsilon} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then by Lemma 5.2 and by $f(\epsilon t) = 0$ if $\|t\| > 1/\epsilon$,

$$V_{n,h,\epsilon}(y, z) = \frac{h^{d-r}}{(2\pi)^d}\int_J e^{-\mathrm{i}(\langle s, y\rangle + \langle t, z\rangle)}[\varphi_\xi(s, t)]^n f(\epsilon t)g(ht)\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}t,$$

where $J = [-\pi, \pi]^r \times [-1/\epsilon, 1/\epsilon]^{d-r}$. Letting $\theta = (a_n s, a_n t)$ and $u = (y/a_n - b_n, z/a_n - c_n)$,

$$V_{n,h,\epsilon}(y, z) = \frac{h^{d-r}}{(2\pi a_n)^d}\int_{a_n J} e^{-\mathrm{i}\langle\theta, u\rangle}k_{n,h,\epsilon}(\theta)\,\mathrm{d}\theta,$$

where $k_{n,h,\epsilon}(\theta) = [\varphi_n(\theta)]^n f(\epsilon t/a_n)g(ht/a_n)$ with $\varphi_n(\theta) = e^{-\mathrm{i}\langle\theta, d_n/n\rangle}\varphi_\xi(\theta/a_n)$. Meanwhile, $\psi(u) = (2\pi)^{-d}\int e^{-\mathrm{i}\langle\theta, u\rangle}\widehat{\psi}(\theta)\,\mathrm{d}\theta$. As $n \to \infty$, for $\epsilon > 0$ and $M > 0$, $\sup_{\|\theta\|\leq M, h\leq 1}|k_{n,h,\epsilon}(\theta) - \widehat{\psi}(\theta)| = o_{\epsilon,M}(1)$. For any $\delta > 0$, $\sup_{\theta\in a_n J,\, \|\theta\| > \delta a_n}|\varphi_n(\theta)| < 1$. From [16], by setting M large enough and δ small enough, the integral of $|\varphi_n(\theta)|^n$ over $\{\theta : M \leq \|\theta\| \leq \delta a_n\}$ is arbitrarily small. Then, following the proofs of Theorem 6.1 of [16] and Lemma 1 of [19],

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{(y,z)\in\Lambda_n,\, h\leq 1}|a_n^d V_{n,h,\epsilon}(y, z) - h^{d-r}\psi(u)| \ll{}& \int_{\|\theta\|\leq M,\, h\leq 1}|k_{n,h,\epsilon}(\theta) - \widehat{\psi}(\theta)|\,\mathrm{d}\theta \\ &+ \int_{\theta\in a_n J,\, \|\theta\| > \delta a_n}|\varphi_n(\theta)|\,\mathrm{d}\theta + \int_{\|\theta\| > M}|\widehat{\psi}(\theta)|\,\mathrm{d}\theta \\ &+ \int_{M < \|\theta\| \leq \delta a_n}|\varphi_n(\theta)|^n\,\mathrm{d}\theta = o_\epsilon(1).\end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof follows the one for Lemma 2 of [19]. ∎

6 Big-n contribution

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We shall use x and $s\omega$ interchangeably with $s \geq 0$ and $\omega \in S^{d-1}$. Writing $x = (u, z)$ with $u \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $F^{*n}(x + \Delta_h)$ is equal to the sum of $F^{*n}(x_a + \Delta_{h/k})$ over $a \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k\}^{d-\nu}$, where $x_a = (u, z + ha/k)$. Thus, if (1.3) holds for $h \in (0, 1)$, then it holds for all $h > 0$. So without loss of generality, let $h \in (0, 1)$.

Fix an arbitrary $M > \delta \vee 1$. Put $J_{s,\delta,M} = [A(\delta s),\, A(Ms)) \cap \mathbb{N}$ and

$$B_{\delta,M}(x, h) = \sum_{n \in J_{s,\delta,M}} F^{*n}(x + \Delta_h).$$

Then $r_{\delta,h}(x) = s^d B_{\delta,M}(x, h)/A(s) + r_{M,h}(x)$. First, from either Proposition 4.1 or Theorem 1.2, $F^{*n}(x+\Delta_h) \ll a_n^{-d}$. Then by $A^{-1} \in \mathcal{R}_{1/\alpha}$ [1, Theorem 1.5.12] and $A^{-1}(t) = [1+o(1)]a_n$ for $t \in [n-1, n+1]$ as $n \to \infty$,

$$r_{M,h}(x) \ll \frac{s^d}{A(s)} \sum_{n \geq A(Ms)} a_n^{-d} \ll \frac{s^d}{A(s)} \int_{A(Ms)}^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{(A^{-1}(t))^d}.$$

By change of variable $t = A(su)$ and $A'(x) = [\alpha + o(1)]A(x)/x$ as $x \to \infty$,

$$\int_{A(Ms)}^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{(A^{-1}(t))^d} \ll \int_M^\infty \frac{A(su)\,\mathrm{d}u}{s^d u^{d+1}} \ll \frac{A(s)}{s^d} \int_M^\infty u^{\alpha-d-1}\,\mathrm{d}u.$$

Since $d > \alpha$, the above two displays show that $r_{M,h}(x) \ll \int_M^\infty u^{\alpha-d-1}\,\mathrm{d}u$ is arbitrarily small if M is large enough. Also, since ψ is bounded, $\sup_{\omega \in S^{d-1}} \int_0^{1/M} \psi(u\omega) u^{d-\alpha-1}\,\mathrm{d}u$ is arbitrarily small as well. Therefore, to show (1.3), it only remains to show

$$\frac{s^d B_{\delta,M}(x, h)}{A(s)} = \alpha q^{-1} h^{d-\nu} \int_{1/M}^{1/\delta} \psi(u\omega) u^{d-\alpha-1}\,\mathrm{d}u + o_{\delta,M,h}(1). \tag{6.1}$$

In the rest of the proof, we assume $\nu > 0$. The proof for the case where $\nu = 0$ can follow the same argument and is actually simpler. Let $x = (u, w, z) \in \mathbb{R}^\nu \times \mathbb{R}^{r-\nu} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-r}$. Put $\Lambda = D^{-1}KI_\nu$. By (1.1),

$$\{S_n(X) \in x + \Delta_h\} = \{S_n(L) \in u + \Lambda,\, S_n(W) \in w + hI_{r-\nu},\, S_n(Z) \in z + hI_{d-r}\}.$$

Since $L \in l_0 + \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, $S_n(L) \in \mathbb{Z}l_0 + \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. From $l_0 = (0, \ldots, 0, p/q)$, with $0 \leq p < q$ being coprime, $\mathbb{Z}l_0 + \mathbb{Z}^\nu = \{(k_1, \ldots, k_{\nu-1}, k_\nu/q) : k_i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, so $D(\mathbb{Z}l_0 + \mathbb{Z}^\nu) = \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. Then by $K^{-1}\mathbb{Z}^\nu = \mathbb{Z}^\nu$,

$$(u + \Lambda) \cap (\mathbb{Z}l_0 + \mathbb{Z}^\nu) = D^{-1}[(Du + KI_\nu) \cap \mathbb{Z}^\nu] = D^{-1}K[(K^{-1}Du + I_\nu) \cap \mathbb{Z}^\nu]$$

is a singleton $\{l\}$. Pick any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $l \in kl_0 + \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $l \in nl_0 + \mathbb{Z}^\nu \iff (n-k)l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \iff (n-k)p/q \in \mathbb{Z} \iff q \,|\, n-k$. There is a unique such n in $0, \ldots, q-1$. Denote it by $\kappa(u)$. It follows that

$$l \in nl_0 + \mathbb{Z}^\nu \iff n \in \kappa(u) + q\mathbb{Z}. \tag{6.2}$$

Since $S_n(L) \in nl_0 + \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, by (6.2), $S_n(L) \in u + \Lambda$ only if $n \in \kappa(u) + q\mathbb{Z}$. Next, since $S_n(W) \in nw_0 + \mathbb{Z}^{r-\nu}$, $S_n(W) \in w + hI_{r-\nu}$ only if $(w + hI_{r-\nu}) \cap (nw_0 + \mathbb{Z}^{r-\nu}) \neq \emptyset$. As a result, for each $n \geq 1$, $F^{*n}(x + \Delta_h) > 0$ only if $n \in R_x$, where

$$R_x = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \in \kappa(u) + q\mathbb{Z},\, (w + hI_{r-\nu}) \cap (nw_0 + \mathbb{Z}^{r-\nu}) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Then by Proposition 5.3, as $s \to \infty$, for $n \geq A(\delta s)$,

$$\begin{aligned} F^{*n}(x+\Delta_h) &= a_n^{-d} h^{d-r}[\psi(x/a_n) + o_\delta(1)] \times \#((w + hI_{r-\nu}) \cap (nw_0 + \mathbb{Z}^{r-\nu})) \\ &= a_n^{-d} h^{d-r}[\psi(x/a_n) + o_\delta(1)]\mathbf{1}\{n \in R_x\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\#(\cdot)$ stands for cardinality of set and the second line is due to the fact that as $h < 1$, $w + hI_{r-\nu}$ contains at most one point in $nw_0 + \mathbb{Z}^{r-\nu}$. Let m_0 and m_1 be the first and last integers in $[A(\delta s), A(Ms) + 1)$. For $s \gg_{\delta,M} 1$, $m_0 \asymp_\delta A(s)$ and $m_1 - m_0 \asymp_{\delta,M} A(s)$. Fix integers $m_0 = N_1 < N_2 < \ldots < N_k < N_{k+1} = m_1$ with $k = k(s)$, such that as $s \to \infty$,

$$\min_i (N_{i+1} - N_i) \to \infty, \quad \min_i (N_{i+1} - N_i) \asymp \max_i (N_{i+1} - N_i) = o_{\delta,M}(A(s)).$$

Then by $A^{-1} \in \mathcal{R}_{1/\alpha}$, it is seen that $\max_i (a_{N_{i+1}} - a_{N_i}) = o_{\delta,M}(s)$. It follows that

$$a_n = a_{N_i}(1 + o_{\delta,M}(1)) \quad \text{for } N_i \leq n < N_{i+1} \tag{6.3}$$

and by the continuity of ψ and $s/a_n = O_\delta(1)$,

$$\psi(x/a_n) = \psi(x/a_{N_i}) + o_{\delta,M}(1). \tag{6.4}$$

Combining the above three displays, by ψ being bounded,

$$F^{*n}(x+\Delta_h) = h^{d-r} a_{N_i}^{-d} \psi(x/a_{N_i}) \mathbf{1}\{n \in R_x\} + o_{\delta,M,h}(a_n^{-d}).$$

Let $g_i(x) = \#(R_x \cap \{N_i, N_i + 1, \ldots, N_{i+1} - 1\})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\delta,M}(x,h) &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{N_i \leq n < N_{i+1}} F^{*n}(x + \Delta_n) \\ &= h^{d-r} \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{N_i}^{-d} \psi(x/a_{N_i}) g_i(x) + o_{\delta,M,h}(1) \sum_{n \in J_{x,\delta,M}} a_n^{-d}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

Since $0 < h < 1$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $N_i \leq n < N_{i+1}$,

$$(w + hI_{r-\nu}) \cap (nw_0 + \mathbb{Z}^{r-\nu}) \neq \emptyset \iff e^{2\pi \mathrm{i}(n\beta_{\nu+j} - w_j)} \in \Gamma \text{ for every } 1 \leq j \leq r - \nu,$$

where Γ is the arc $\{e^{2\pi \mathrm{i} z} : 0 \leq z < h\}$ of the unit circle S^1. Let

$$b_i = \lceil (N_i - \kappa(u))/q \rceil, \quad c_i = \lceil (N_{i+1} - \kappa(u))/q \rceil - 1.$$

For $s \gg_{\delta,M} 1$, $N_i - \kappa(u) > A(\delta s) - q > 0$, so $b_i \geq 1$. Therefore, by (6.2), for $N_i \leq n < N_{i+1}$, $n \in \kappa(u) + q\mathbb{Z} \iff n = \kappa(u) + qk$ with $b_i \leq k \leq c_i$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} g_i(x) &= \sum_{k=0}^{c_i - b_i} \prod_{j=1}^{r-\nu} \mathbf{1}\{e^{2\pi \mathrm{i}((\kappa(u) + (b_i + k)q)\beta_{\nu+j} - w_j)} \in \Gamma\} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{c_i - b_i} \prod_{j=1}^{r-\nu} \mathbf{1}\{\theta_j e^{2\pi \mathrm{i} k \tau_j} \in \Gamma\}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

where $\theta_j = e^{2\pi \mathrm{i}((\kappa(u)+b_i q)\beta_{\nu+j} - w_j)}$ and $\tau_j = q\beta_{\nu+j}$. Let $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{r-\nu})$. Then $\theta \in \mathbb{K} := (S^1)^{r-\nu}$. Define

$$Tz = (z_1 e^{2\pi \mathrm{i}\tau_1}, \dots, z_{r-\nu} e^{2\pi \mathrm{i}\tau_{r-\nu}}), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^{r-\nu}.$$

Under the Euclidean norm, T is an isometry and $T\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{K}$. Since $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{r-\nu}$ are rationally independent, for any $\theta \in \mathbb{K}$, $\{T^n\theta\}_{n\ge 0}$ is dense in $\mathbb{K}$ [14, p. 158]. Then the pair $(\mathbb{K}, T)$ is strictly ergodic [14, Proposition 4.2.15], and the normalized Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{K}$ is the unique probability measure invariant under T. By Proposition 4.2.8 of [14] followed by dominated convergence, as $n \to \infty$, uniformly for $\theta \in \mathbb{K}$

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n}\prod_{j=1}^{r-\nu} \mathbf{1}\{\theta_j e^{2\pi \mathrm{i} k\tau_j} \in \Gamma\} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n} \mathbf{1}\{T^k\theta \in \Gamma^{r-\nu}\} \to h^{r-\nu}.$$

Then by (6.6), as $s \to \infty$, for $1 \le i \le s$,

$$g_i(x) = [1 + o(1)](c_i - b_i)h^{r-\nu} = [1 + o_{\delta,M}(1)]q^{-1}(N_{i+1} - N_i)h^{r-\nu},$$

which together with (6.5) and another application of (6.3) and (6.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\delta,M}(x,h) &= [1 + o_{\delta,M}(1)]q^{-1}h^{d-\nu}\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{N_i}^{-d}\psi(x/a_{N_i})(N_{i+1} - N_i) \\ &\quad + o_{\delta,M,h}(1)\sum_{n\in J_{x,\delta,M}} a_n^{-d} \\ &= q^{-1}h^{d-\nu}\sum_{n\in J_{x,\delta,M}} a_n^{-d}\psi(x/a_n) + o_{\delta,M,h}(1)\sum_{n\in J_{x,\delta,M}} a_n^{-d}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $[A^{-1}(t)]^{-d}\psi(x/A^{-1}(t)) = a_n^{-d}[\psi(x/a_n) + o_\delta(1)]$ for $n \ge A(\delta s)$ and $t \in [n-1, n+1]$, then

$$B_{\delta,M}(x,h) = q^{-1}h^{d-\nu}\int_{A(\delta s)}^{A(Ms)} \frac{\psi(x/A^{-1}(t))}{(A^{-1}(t))^d}\,\mathrm{d}t + o_{\delta,M,h}(1)\sum_{n\in J_{x,\delta,M}} a_n^{-d}.$$

As $s \to \infty$, by change of variable $t = A(s/u)$, the integral on the RHS is

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{1/M}^{1/\delta} \frac{\psi(u\omega)}{(s/u)^d}\frac{sA'(s/u)}{u^2}\,\mathrm{d}u &= [1 + o_{\delta,M,h}(1)]\alpha\int_{1/M}^{1/\delta}\frac{\psi(u\omega)}{(s/u)^d}\frac{A(s/u)}{u}\,\mathrm{d}u \\ &= [1 + o_{\delta,M,h}(1)]\frac{\alpha A(s)}{s^d}\int_{1/M}^{1/\delta}\psi(u\omega)u^{d-\alpha-1}\,\mathrm{d}u. \end{aligned}$$

Then (6.1) follows by noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n\in J_{x,\delta}} a_n^{-d} &= [1 + o_{\delta,M}(1)]\int_{A(\delta s)}^{A(Ms)}\frac{\mathrm{d}t}{(A^{-1}(t))^d} \\ &= [1 + o_{\delta,M}(1)]\frac{\alpha A(s)}{s^d}\int_{1/M}^{1/\delta} u^{d-1-\alpha}\,\mathrm{d}u. \end{aligned}$$

□

The following corollary of Theorem 1.2 will be useful

Corollary 6.1. *Under the setup in Theorem 1.2, given $\delta > 0$ and $h > 0$, as $s \to \infty$*

$$\sup_{\omega \in S^{d-1},\, \eta \geq \delta} |r_{\eta,h}(s\omega) - h^{d-\nu} \varrho_\eta(\omega)| = o_{\delta,h}(1). \tag{6.7}$$

Proof. From the proof of Theorem 1.2, it suffices to show that given $M > \delta$, as $s \to \infty$,

$$\sup_{\omega \in S^{d-1},\, \delta \leq \eta \leq M} |r_{\eta,h}(s\omega) - h^{d-\nu} \varrho_\eta(\omega)| = o_{\delta,h}(1). \tag{6.8}$$

For $\delta \leq \eta < \theta \leq M$, by (1.2), $0 \leq \varrho_\eta(\omega) - \varrho_\theta(\omega) \ll \int_{1/\theta}^{1/\eta} u^{d-\alpha-1}\, \mathrm{d}u \ll \eta^{\alpha-d} - \theta^{\alpha-d}$, and by $F^{*n}(x + \Delta_h) \ll a_n^{-d}$ and the argument at the end of the proof of Theorem 1.2, for $s \gg_\delta 1$,

$$0 \leq r_{\eta,h}(s\omega) - r_{\theta,h}(s\omega) \ll \frac{s^d}{A(s)} \sum_{A(\eta s) \leq n \leq A(\theta s)} a_n^{-d} \ll_\delta \eta^{\alpha-d} - \theta^{\alpha-d}.$$

It follows that (6.8) can be reduced to $\sup_{\omega \in S^{d-1}, \eta \in E} |r_{\eta,h}(s\omega) - h^{d-\nu} \varrho_\eta(\omega)| = o_{\delta,h}(1)$, where E is a finite set in $[\delta, M]$ with its adjacent elements being arbitrarily close. Then Theorem 1.2 can be invoked to finish the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 1.3. 1) Let $K\xi = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{\nu-1}, p + q\zeta_\nu)$, where $K \in \mathbb{Z}^{\nu \times \nu}$ is non-singular, $0 \leq p < q$ are coprime and $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_\nu) \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ is strongly aperiodic. By $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, $\langle t, \xi \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $t \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. Conversely, if $\langle t, \xi \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$, then letting $s = (K')^{-1} t$, $\langle s, K\xi \rangle = s_1\zeta_1 + \cdots + s_{\nu-1}\zeta_{\nu-1} + qs_\nu\zeta_\nu + ps_\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$. The strong aperiodicity of ζ implies $s_1, \dots, s_{\nu-1}, qs_\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$, which in turn gives $ps_\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since p and q are coprime, then $s_\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus $s \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ and $t = K's \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. This shows ξ is aperiodic.

Conversely, let ξ be aperiodic. Let $\Gamma = \{t : \langle t, \xi \rangle \in a + \mathbb{Z} \text{ for some } a\}$. From the proof of Proposition 1.1, Γ is a lattice. Since $\mathbb{Z}^\nu \subset \Gamma$, by Smith normal form [20, Theorem 3.7], there are linearly independent $u_1, \dots, u_\nu \in \Gamma$ and integers $1 \leq n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_\nu$ with $n_i \,|\, n_{i+1}$, such that, letting $M = (u_1, \dots, u_\nu)$ and $D = \mathrm{diag}(n_1, \dots, n_\nu)$,

$$\Gamma = M\mathbb{Z}^\nu, \quad \mathbb{Z}^\nu = MD\mathbb{Z}^\nu. \tag{6.9}$$

By $u_i \in \Gamma$, $\langle u_i, \xi \rangle \in s_i + \mathbb{Z}$ for some s_i. In matrix form, this means $M'\xi \in s + \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, where $s = (s_1, \dots, s_\nu)$. Define $K = DM'$, $Z = K\xi$, and $b = Ds$. From the second identity in (6.9), $\mathbb{Z}^\nu = K'\mathbb{Z}^\nu$, giving $K, K^{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\nu \times \nu}$. Then it is easy to see that $Z \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ is aperiodic. Meanwhile, $Z = DM'\xi \in D(s + \mathbb{Z}^\nu) = b + D\mathbb{Z}^\nu$. Then from $Z \in (b + D\mathbb{Z}^\nu) \cap \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ and $D\mathbb{Z}^\nu \subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, $b \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. Let $Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_1', Z_2', \dots$ be i.i.d. $\sim Z$. For $m, n \geq 0$, $S_m(Z) - S_n(Z') \in \mathbb{Z}b + D\mathbb{Z}^\nu \subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. By aperiodicity of Z, for every standard base vector e_i of $\mathbb{R}^\nu$, there are m and n such that $\mathbb{P}\{S_m(Z) - S_n(Z') = e_i\} > 0$ [18, p. 20]. This yields $e_i \in b\mathbb{Z} + D\mathbb{Z}^\nu$. As a result, $\mathbb{Z}b + D\mathbb{Z}^\nu = \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. Let $s_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $v_i = (v_{i1}, \dots, v_{i\nu}) \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, such that $bs_i + Dv_i = e_i$. Write $b = (b_1, \dots, b_\nu)$. By comparing the coordinates,

$$b_i s_i + n_i v_{ii} = 1, \quad b_j s_i + n_j v_{ij} = 0,\ j \neq i.$$

The first set of equations imply that each pair of b_i and n_i are coprime. Since $n_j \neq 0$, the second set of equations imply that for $i \neq j$, $n_j \,|\, b_j s_i$, so $n_j \,|\, s_i$. But then by $b_i(s_i/n_j)n_j + n_i v_{ii} = 1$, n_j and n_i are coprime. For $i < j$, by $n_i \,|\, n_j$, this implies $n_i = 1$. As a result, $n_1 = \cdots = n_{\nu-1} = 1$ and b_ν and n_ν are coprime. Put $q = n_\nu$ and let $0 \leq p < q$

such that $q \,|\, (b_\nu - p)$. Let $\zeta = D^{-1}(Z - pe_\nu)$. By $Z \in b + \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ and $b - pe_\nu \in D\mathbb{Z}^\nu$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. If $\langle t, \zeta \rangle \in s + \mathbb{Z}$ for some s, then simple calculation gives $\langle Mt, \xi \rangle \in c + \mathbb{Z}$ with $c = s + p\langle t, D^{-1}e_\nu \rangle$. Consequently, $Mt \in \Gamma = M\mathbb{Z}^\nu$, and so $t \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. Thus ζ is strongly aperiodic. By $K\xi = Z = pe_\nu + D\zeta$, the proof is complete.

2) Let $\zeta = L - \beta_\nu e_\nu = L - (p/q)e_\nu$. Then $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. Since for $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|\varphi_{TX}(2\pi u)| = 1 \iff u \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \times \{0\}$, then for $v \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$, $|\varphi_\zeta(2\pi v)| = |\varphi_L(2\pi v)| = 1 \iff v \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, so ζ is strongly aperiodic. Then by 1), $DL = (\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_{\nu-1}, p + q\zeta_\nu) \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ is aperiodic. □

Let $X \sim F$ be aperiodic on $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$. In [18], P26.1 and [23], it is shown that as $|x| \to \infty$,

$$\frac{|x|^d}{A(|x|)} \sum_{n \ge A(\delta|x|)} \mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in x + I_\nu\} = \alpha \int_0^{1/\delta} \psi(u\omega) u^{d-\alpha-1} \, \mathrm{d}u + o_{\delta,h}(1), \tag{6.10}$$

where ψ is the density of the limiting law of $S_n(X)/a_n$. The technique used there is to approximate the aperiodic case by a strongly aperiodic one, by adding an arbitrarily small mass at $0 \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. We next give an alternative proof. By Proposition 1.3, $X = K(b + D\zeta)$, where $K \in \mathbb{Z}^{\nu\times\nu}$ with $\det K = \pm 1$, $b = pe_\nu$, $D = \mathrm{diag}(1, \ldots, 1, q)$ with $0 \le p < q$ being coprime, and $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ is strongly aperiodic. Let $l_0 = (p/q)e_\nu$ and $L = l_0 + \zeta$. By $L = (KD)^{-1}X$ and $|\det(KD)| = q$, $\tilde\psi(x) = q\psi(KDx)$ is the density of the limiting law of $S_n(L)/a_n$. Write $(KD)^{-1}x = s\omega$, with $s > 0$ and $\omega \in S^{d-1}$. Then the LHS of (6.10) equals

$$\frac{|KD\omega|^d s^d}{A(|KD\omega|s)} \sum_{n \ge A(\delta|KD\omega|s)} \mathbb{P}\{S_n(L) \in s\omega + D^{-1}K^{-1}I_\nu\}.$$

Since KD is nonsingular, $\inf_\omega |KD\omega| > 0$. Then by Corollary 6.1, the above quantity is

$$\frac{|KD\omega|^d A(s)}{A(|KD\omega|s)} \times \alpha q^{-1} \int_0^{1/\delta|KD\omega|} \tilde\psi(u\omega) u^{d-\alpha-1} \, \mathrm{d}u + o_{\delta,h}(1).$$

Since $\tilde\psi(u\omega) = q\psi(uKD\omega) = q\psi(u|KD\omega|x/|x|)$, by change of variable $v = |KD\omega|u$, it is seen that (6.10) follows.

7 Small-n contribution

This section proves Theorem 1.5. First some notation. For $n \ge k \ge 1$, denote by $x_{n:1}$, $\ldots$, $x_{n:n}$ a permutation of $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ such that $|x_{n:i}|$ are sorted in decreasing order and $S_{n:k}(x) = x_{n:1} + \cdots + x_{n:k}$. Define $|x_{n:0}| = \infty$, $S_{n:0}(x) = 0$, and $x_{n:k} = 0$ for $k > n$.

The proof follows from four lemmas. For the first two, fix $\gamma \in (d\alpha^{-1}(\kappa+1)^{-1}, 1)$, which is nonempty as $\kappa + 1 > d/\alpha$. Define

$$\zeta_{n,s} = a_n^{1-\gamma} s^\gamma, \quad n \ge 1, \ s > 0.$$

Lemma 7.1. *Let $k = \kappa + 1$ and $b = [d/(k\gamma) + \alpha]/2$. Note that $k\gamma b > d$ and $b \in (0, \alpha)$. Given $\delta \in (0, 1)$, for $s \gg_\delta 1$,*

$$\sum_{n \le A(\delta s)} \sup_{|x| \ge s} \mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in x + hI_d, \ |X_{n:k}| > \zeta_{n,|x|}\} \ll_h \delta^{k\gamma b + \alpha - d} \frac{A(s)}{s^d}.$$

Lemma 7.2. *Fix $k \geq 0$ and $\epsilon, \delta \in (0,1)$. For $n \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, denote*

$$E_{n,x} = \{S_n(X) \in x + hI_d,\ |X_{n:k}| > \zeta_{n,|x|} \geq |X_{n:k+1}|\}.$$

For $s \gg_{\epsilon,\delta} 1$,

$$\sum_{n \leq A(\delta s)} \sup_{|x| \geq s} \mathbb{P}\{E_{n,x},\ |S_{n:k}(X)| \leq (1-\epsilon)|x|\} \ll_{h,k} \frac{A(\delta s)}{s^d} \int_{1/(2\delta)}^{\infty} u^{d-1} e^{-\epsilon u^{1-\gamma}}\, \mathrm{d}u.$$

In particular, if $k \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{n \leq A(\delta s)} \sup_{|x| \geq s} \mathbb{P}\{E_{n,x},\ |X_{n:1}| \leq (1-\epsilon)|x|/k\} \ll_{h,k} \frac{A(\delta s)}{s^d} \int_{1/(2\delta)}^{\infty} u^{d-1} e^{-\epsilon u^{1-\gamma}}\, \mathrm{d}u.$$

For the next two lemmas, define $S'_n(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \mathbf{1}\{|X_i| > a_n\} = S_n(Y^{(n)})$, where $Y^{(n)} = X\mathbf{1}\{|X| > a_n\}$.

Lemma 7.3. *Given $0 < \delta < \epsilon < 1$, for $s \gg_{\epsilon,\delta} 1$,*

$$\sum_{n \leq A(\delta s)} \sup_{|x| \geq s} \mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in x + hI_d,\ |S_n(X) - S'_n(X)| \geq \epsilon|x|\} \ll_h \frac{A(\delta s)}{s^d} \int_{1/(2\delta)}^{\infty} u^{d-1} e^{-c\epsilon u}\, \mathrm{d}u.$$

Lemma 7.4. *Fix $0 < \theta < \nu < 1$ and $0 < \eta < \epsilon < \nu - \theta$. Let $\chi > 0$ be the constant described in Corollary 4.2. For $s \gg_{\theta,\nu,\eta,\epsilon,h} 1$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in s\omega + hI_d,\ |X_{n:1}| > \nu s,\ |S_n(X) - S'_n(X)| < \eta s\} \ll_h n a_n^{-d} \sup_{|t| > \theta s} K(t, a_n/\chi, \epsilon/\theta, h).$$

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Since $K(t, a_n/\chi, \eta, h)$ is increasing in η, we can assume $\eta > 0$ to be as small as desired. Since $\theta\kappa < 1$ we can let $\eta < 1/(\theta\kappa) - 1$. Fix $\nu \in ((1+\eta)\theta, 1/\kappa)$. Then $\mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in s\omega + hI_d\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^4 C_{n,i}$, where,

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{n,1} &= \mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in s\omega + hI_d,\ |X_{n:\kappa+1}| > \zeta_{n,s}\} + \mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in s\omega + hI_d,\ |X_{n:1}| \leq \zeta_{n,s}\},\\
C_{n,2} &= \mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in s\omega + hI_d,\ |X_{n:\kappa+1}| \leq \zeta_{n,s} < |X_{n:1}| \leq \nu s\},\\
C_{n,3} &= \mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in s\omega + hI_d,\ |S_n(X) - S'_n(X)| \geq 0.9\theta\eta s\},\\
C_{n,4} &= \mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in s\omega + hI_d,\ |X_{n:1}| > \nu s,\ |S_n(X) - S'_n(X)| < 0.9\theta\eta s\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The sum of $C_{n,1}$ over $n \leq A(\delta s)$ can be bounded using Lemma 7.1 and Lemma 7.2 (for the case $k = 0$), the sum of $C_{n,2}$ can be bounded using Lemma 7.2, the sum of $C_{n,3}$ can be bounded using Lemma 7.3, and the sum of $C_{n,4}$ can be bounded using Lemma 7.4. □

Proof of Lemma 7.1. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $n \geq 1$, define

$$f_n(x) = \mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in x + hI_d,\ |X_{n:k}| > \zeta_{n,|x|}\}.$$

Clearly, if $n < k$, then $f_n(s\omega) = 0$. For $n \geq k$, $s > 0$ and $\omega \in S^{d-1}$,

$$f_n(s\omega) \leq n^k \mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in s\omega + hI_d,\ |X_{k:k}| > \zeta_{n,s}\}.$$

For any $z_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in s\omega + hI_d \,|\, X_i = z_i, , \, i \le k\} = \mathbb{P}\{S_{n-k}(X) \in s\omega - S_k(z) + hI_d\} \le Q_{S_{n-k}(X)}(h)$. Then by Proposition 4.1, the above display yields

$$\sum_{n \le A(\delta s)} \sup_{|x| \ge s} f_n(x) \ll_h \sum_{n \le A(\delta s)} a_{n-k}^{-d} n^k \mathbb{P}\{|X_{k:k}| > \zeta_{n,s}\} \ll \sum_{n \le A(\delta s)} a_n^{-d} n^k q_X(\zeta_{n,s})^k. \quad (7.1)$$

For $s \gg_\delta 1$, since $q_X(s) \ll 1/A(s)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \le A(\delta s)} a_n^{-d} n^k q_X(\zeta_{n,s})^k &\ll \sum_{n \le A(\delta s)} \frac{n^k}{a_n^d A(\zeta_{n,s})^k} \\ &\asymp \int_1^{A(\delta s)} \frac{t^k \, \mathrm{d}t}{(A^{-1}(t))^d A(A^{-1}(t)^{1-\gamma} s^\gamma)^k} \\ &= \int_{a_1}^{\delta s} \frac{A(u)^k A'(u) \, \mathrm{d}u}{u^d A(u^{1-\gamma} s^\gamma)^k}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line is due to change of variable $t = A(u)$. By $A'(u) \asymp A(u)/u$, for $s \gg_\delta 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \le A(\delta s)} a_n^{-d} n^k q_X(\zeta_{n,s})^k &\ll \int_{a_1}^{\delta s} \frac{A(u)^{k+1} \, \mathrm{d}u}{u^{d+1} A(u^{1-\gamma} s^\gamma)^k} \\ &\ll A(\delta s) \int_{a_1}^{\delta s} \frac{1}{u^{d+1}} \left[\frac{A(u)}{A(u^{1-\gamma} s^\gamma)} \right]^k \mathrm{d}u. \end{aligned}$$

For $a_1 \le u \le \delta s$, since $u < u^{1-\gamma} s^\gamma$ and $b \in (0, \alpha)$, by Potter's Theorem [1, Th. 1.5.6], $A(u)/A(u^{1-\gamma} s^\gamma) \ll [u/(u^{1-\gamma} s^\gamma)]^b = (u/s)^{b\gamma}$. Then by $k\gamma b > d$,

$$\int_{a_1}^{\delta s} \frac{1}{u^{d+1}} \left[\frac{A(u)}{A(u^{1-\gamma} s^\gamma)} \right]^k \mathrm{d}u \ll \int_0^{\delta s} \frac{(u/s)^{k\gamma b}}{u^{d+1}} \, \mathrm{d}u \ll \frac{1}{s^d} \frac{\delta^{k\gamma b - d}}{k\gamma b - d}.$$

By $A(\delta s) \asymp \delta^\alpha A(s)$ for $s \gg_\delta 1$, the above two displays together imply

$$\sum_{n \le A(\delta s)} a_n^{-d} n^k q_X(\zeta_{n,s})^k \ll \frac{A(s)}{s^d} \frac{\delta^{k\gamma b + \alpha - d}}{k\gamma b - d}.$$

This combined with (7.1) finishes the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 7.2. With $k \ge 0$ and $\epsilon, \delta \in (0,1)$ being fixed, define

$$f_n(x) = \mathbb{P}\{E_{n,x}, \, |S_{n:k}(X)| \le (1-\epsilon)|x|\}.$$

If $n < k$, then $E_{n,x} = \emptyset$ and so $f_n(x) = 0$. Let $n \ge k$. Define

$$g_n(x) = \mathbb{P}\left\{ \begin{array}{c} S_n(X) \in x + hI_d, \, |S_k(X)| \le (1-\epsilon)|x| \\ \text{and } |X_i| > \zeta_{n,|x|} \ge |X_j|, \, i \le k < j \end{array} \right\}.$$

Then $f_n(x) \le n^k g_n(x)$. Let $Y_j = X_{k+j}$. By $S_n(X) = S_k(X) + S_{n-k}(Y)$, for $s > 0$ and $\omega \in S^{d-1}$, if $S_n(X) \in s\omega + hI_d$ and $|S_k(X)| \le (1-\epsilon)s$, then $|S_{n-k}(Y)| \ge |S_n(X)| - |S_k(X)| \ge \epsilon s - h\sqrt{d}$, so

$$g_n(s\omega) \le \mathbb{P}\left\{ \begin{array}{c} S_{n-k}(Y) \in s\omega - S_k(X) + hI_d, \, |S_{n-k}(Y)| \ge \epsilon s - h\sqrt{d}, \\ \text{and } |X_{k:k}| > \zeta_{n,s} \ge |Y_{n-k:1}| \end{array} \right\}.$$

By conditioning on $X_i = z_i$, $i \le k$, with $|z_i| > \zeta_{n,s}$,

$$g_n(s\omega) \le \mathbb{P}\{|X_{k:k}| > \zeta_{n,s}\} M_{n,s} = q_X(\zeta_{n,s})^k M_{n,s},$$

where

$$M_{n,s} = \sup_{|x| \ge \epsilon s - h\sqrt{d}} \mathbb{P}\{S_{n-k}(Y) \in x + hI_d,\ |Y_{n-k:1}| \le \zeta_{n,s}\}.$$

By Proposition 4.1, there is $C > 0$ that only depends on $\{F, A\}$, such that

$$M_{n,s} \ll_h (\zeta_{n,s}^{-d} + a_{n-k}^{-d}) e^{-\epsilon s/\zeta_{n,s} + Cn/A(\zeta_{n,s})}$$

for $s \gg_\epsilon 1$ and $n \ge k$. For $n \le A(\delta s)$, as $\zeta_{n,s} = a_n^{1-\gamma} s^\gamma \ge a_n$, $M_{n,s} \ll_{h,k} a_n^{-d} e^{-\epsilon (s/a_n)^{1-\gamma}}$. As a result, $g_n(s\omega) \ll_{h,k} a_n^{-d} q_X(\zeta_{n,s})^k e^{-\epsilon (s/a_n)^{1-\gamma}}$, and hence

$$f_n(s\omega) \le n^k g_n(s\omega) \ll_{h,k} a_n^{-d} n^k q_X(\zeta_{n,s})^k e^{-\epsilon (s/a_n)^{1-\gamma}} \ll_{h,k} a_n^{-d} e^{-\epsilon (s/a_n)^{1-\gamma}}, \tag{7.2}$$

where the last bound is due to $n q_X(\zeta_{n,s}) \ll A(a_n)/A(\zeta_{n,s}) \le 1$. Take sum over $n \le A(\delta s)$. Since for $n \ge 1$ and $t \in [n, n+1]$, $a_n \le A^{-1}(t) \ll a_n$, then for $s \gg_\delta 1$,

$$\sum_{n \le A(\delta s)} \sup_{|x| \ge s} f_n(x) \ll_{h,k} \int_1^{A(2\delta s)} \frac{1}{A^{-1}(t)^d} e^{-\epsilon (s/A^{-1}(t))^{1-\gamma}} \, \mathrm{d}t.$$

By change of variable $t = A(s/u)$, or $u = s/A^{-1}(t)$, and use $A'(x) \asymp A(x)/x$ for $x > 0$, the last integral is no greater than

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{1/(2\delta)}^\infty \frac{1}{(s/u)^d} e^{-\epsilon u^{1-\gamma}} A'(s/u) s u^{-2} \, \mathrm{d}u &\ll s^{-d} \int_{1/(2\delta)}^\infty u^{d-1} e^{-\epsilon u^{1-\gamma}} A(s/u) \, \mathrm{d}u \\ &\le s^{-d} A(2\delta s) \int_{1/(2\delta)}^\infty u^{d-1} e^{-\epsilon u^{1-\gamma}} \, \mathrm{d}u. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two displays then finishes the proof. □

To prove Lemmas 7.3 and 7.4, define

$$\tau_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{|X_i| > a_n\},$$

Then $\mathbb{P}\{\tau_n = m\} = \binom{n}{m} q_X(a_n)^m [1 - q_X(a_n)]^{n-m}$ and by $q_X(a_n) \ll 1/A(a_n) = 1/n$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\tau_n = m\} \le \frac{n! O(1/n)^m}{m!(n-m)!} \ll \frac{O(1)^m}{m!}. \tag{7.3}$$

Conditioning on $\tau_n = m$,

$$(S_n(X) - S'_n(X), S'_n(X)) \sim (S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}), S_m(u^{(n)})),$$

where $b_1^{(n)}, b_2^{(n)}, \ldots, u_1^{(n)}, u_2^{(n)}, \ldots$ are independent, with

$$\mathbb{P}\{b_i^{(n)} \in \mathrm{d}x\} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}\{X \in \mathrm{d}x \,|\, |X| \le a_n\} & \text{if } q_X(a_n) < 1 \\ \delta_0(\mathrm{d}x) & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbb{P}\{u_i^{(n)} \in \mathrm{d}x\} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}\{X \in \mathrm{d}x \,|\, |X| > a_n\} & \text{if } q_X(a_n) > 0 \\ \delta_0(\mathrm{d}x) & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

where δ_0 is the unit measure concentrated at 0.

Proof of Lemma 7.3. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $n \geq 1$, denote

$$f_n(x) = \mathbb{P}\{S_n(X) \in x + hI_d,\ |S_n(X) - S'_n(X)| \geq \epsilon|x|\}.$$

For $n \leq A(\delta s)$ and $\omega \in S^{d-1}$,

$$f_n(s\omega) = \sum_{m=0}^{n} \mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) + S_m(u^{(n)}) \in s\omega + hI_d,\ |S_{n-m}(b^{(n)})| \geq \epsilon s\}\mathbb{P}\{\tau_n = m\}. \quad (7.4)$$

For each $m \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) + S_m(u^{(n)}) \in s\omega + hI_d,\ |S_{n-m}(b^{(n)})| \geq \epsilon s\} \\
&= \int \mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) \in s\omega - z + hI_d,\ |S_{n-m}(b^{(n)})| \geq \epsilon s\}\mathbb{P}\{S_m(u^{(n)}) \in \mathrm{d}z\} \\
&\leq \sup_{|x|\geq \epsilon s} \mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) \in x + hI_d\}. \qquad (7.5)
\end{aligned}$$

For n with $q_X(a_n) < 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) \in x + hI_d\} = \frac{\mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(X) \in x + hI_d,\ |X_{n-m:1}| \leq a_n\}}{\mathbb{P}\{|X_{n-m:1}| \leq a_n\}}.$$

By $\mathbb{P}\{|X_{n-m:1}| \leq a_n\} \geq [1 - q_X(a_n)]^n \gg 1$ and Corollary 4.2, if $|x| \geq \epsilon s$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) \in x + hI_d\} \ll_h (a_{n-m}^{-d} + a_n^{-d})e^{-c|x|/a_n + C(n-m)/A(a_n)} \ll a_{n-m}^{-d} e^{-c\epsilon s/a_n},$$

where $c > 0$ and $C > 0$ are constants only depending on $\{F, A\}$. For n with $q_X(a_n) = 1$, as $b_i^{(n)} \equiv 0$, the bound still holds. Combining it with (7.4)–(7.5),

$$f_n(s\omega) \ll_h e^{-c\epsilon s/a_n} \sum_{m=0}^{n} a_{n-m}^{-d}\mathbb{P}\{\tau_n = m\}$$

Since by (7.3),

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m=0}^{n} a_{n-m}^{-d}\mathbb{P}\{\tau_n = m\} &\ll a_n^{-d} \sum_{m \leq n/2} \mathbb{P}\{\tau_n = m\} + a_0^{-d} \sum_{n/2 < m \leq n} \frac{O(1)^m}{m!} \\
&\ll a_n^{-d} + \frac{O(1)^n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor!} \ll a_n^{-d},
\end{aligned}$$

then,

$$\sum_{n \leq A(\delta s)} \sup_{|x| \geq s} f_n(x) \ll_h \sum_{n \leq A(\delta s)} a_n^{-d} e^{-c\epsilon s/a_n}$$

The rest of the proof is similar to the argument that starts with (7.2) for Lemma 7.2. □

Proof of Lemma 7.4. Denote the LHS by $f_n(s\omega)$. For $s \gg_{\eta,h} 1$, if $S_n(X) \in s\omega + hI_d$ and $|S_n(X) - S'_n(X)| < \eta s$, then $S'_n(X) \neq 0$, yielding $\tau_n \geq 1$ and $|X_{n:1}| > a_n$. Therefore, if

$q_X(a_n) = 0$, then $f_n(s\omega) = 0$ and the bound trivially holds. In the rest of the proof, let $q_X(a_n) > 0$. Then

$$f_n(s\omega) \le \sum_{m=1}^{n} P_m(s\omega)\mathbb{P}\{\tau_n = m\}, \tag{7.6}$$

where, with n being fixed, for each $m = 1, \dots, n$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_m(s\omega) &= \mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) + S_m(u^{(n)}) \in s\omega + hI_d,\, |u^{(n)}_{m:1}| > \nu s,\, |S_{n-m}(b^{(n)})| < \eta s\} \\ &= \int_{|y|<\eta s} \mathbb{P}\{S_m(u^{(n)}) \in s\omega - y + hI_d,\, |u^{(n)}_{m:1}| > \nu s\}\mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) \in \mathrm{d}y\} \\ &\le m \int_{|y|<\eta s} \mathbb{P}\{S_m(u^{(n)}) \in s\omega - y + hI_d,\, |u^{(n)}_{1}| > \nu s\}\mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) \in \mathrm{d}y\}. \end{aligned}$$

Denote $T = s\omega - (u^{(n)}_2 + \cdots + u^{(n)}_m)$. By independence of T and $u^{(n)}_1$, with the latter following the distribution of X conditioning on $|X| > a_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{S_m(u^{(n)}) \in s\omega - y + hI_d,\, |u^{(n)}_1| > \nu s\} &= \mathbb{P}\{X \in T - y + hI_d,\, |X| > \nu s \,|\, |X| > a_n\} \\ &\le \frac{\mathbb{P}\{X \in T - y + hI_d,\, |X| > \nu s\}}{q_X(a_n)}. \end{aligned}$$

For $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|y| < \eta s$, if $X \in T - y + hI_d$ and $|X| > \nu s$, then $|T| \ge |X| - |y| - h\sqrt{d} > (\nu - \eta)s - h\sqrt{d}$. For $s \gg_{\eta,\nu,\theta,h} 1$, $(\nu - \eta)s - h\sqrt{d} > \theta s$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} P_m(s\omega) &\le \frac{m}{q_X(a_n)} \int_{|y|<\eta s} \mathbb{P}\{X \in T - y + hI_d,\, |X| > \nu s\}\mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) \in \mathrm{d}y\} \\ &\le \frac{m}{q_X(a_n)} \int_{|y|<\eta s} \mathbb{P}\{X \in T - y + hI_d,\, |T| > \theta s\}\mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) \in \mathrm{d}y\} \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$G_{n,m}(t,s) = \int_{|y|<\eta s} F(t - y + hI_d)\, \mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) \in \mathrm{d}y\}.$$

Then by Fubini's theorem, the last inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} P_m(s\omega) &\le \frac{m}{q_X(a_n)} \int_{|t|>\theta s} G_{n,m}(t,s)\mathbb{P}\{T \in \mathrm{d}t\} \\ &\le \frac{m}{q_X(a_n)} \sup_{|t|>\theta s} G_{n,m}(t,s). \end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

Given $v \in hI_d$, $\eta s B_d$ is covered by disjoint cubes $z + hI_d$ with $z \in (v + h\mathbb{Z}^d) \cap (\eta s + h\sqrt{d})B_d$. If $y \in z + hI_d$, then $-y + hI_d \subset -z + hJ_d$, where $J_d = (-1, 1)^d$. As a result, for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} G_{n,m}(t,s) &\le \sum_{z \in (v+h\mathbb{Z}^d)\cap(\eta s + h\sqrt{d})B_d} \int_{z+hI_d} F(t - y + hI_d)\mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) \in \mathrm{d}y\} \\ &\le \sum_{z \in (v+h\mathbb{Z}^d)\cap(\eta s + h\sqrt{d})B_d} F(t - z + hJ_d)\mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) \in z + hI_d\}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

Since $q(a_n) \ll 1/n$, for all $n \geq 1$ with $q(a_n) < 1$ and $1 \leq m \leq n$, $\mathbb{P}\{|X_{n-m:1}| \leq a_n\} \geq [1 - q_X(a_n)]^n \gg 1$. Then for each z,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) \in z + hI_d\} &= \frac{\mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(X) \in z + hI_d,\, |X_{n-m:1}| \leq a_n\}}{\mathbb{P}\{|X_{n-m:1}| \leq a_n\}} \\ &\ll \mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(X) \in z + hI_d,\, |X_{n-m:1}| \leq a_n\}.\end{aligned}$$

Applying Corollary 4.2 to the RHS

$$\mathbb{P}\{S_{n-m}(b^{(n)}) \in z + hI_d\} \ll_h a_{n-m}^{-d} e^{-\chi|z|/a_n}.$$

On the other hand, if $q(a_n) = 1$, then the LHS is $\mathbf{1}\{0 \in z + hI_d\} \leq \mathbf{1}\{|z| \leq h\sqrt{d}\}$. Since there is only a finite number of such n, the above inequality still holds. Then by (7.8),

$$G_{n,m}(t,s) \ll_h a_{n-m}^{-d} \sum_{z \in (v+h\mathbb{Z}^d) \cap (\eta s + h\sqrt{d})B_d} F(t - z + hJ_d) e^{-\chi|z|/a_n}.$$

Let $u = z - v$. Then $z \in (v + h\mathbb{Z}^d) \cap (\eta s + h\sqrt{d})B_d$ implies $u \in (h\mathbb{Z}^d) \cap (\eta s + 2h\sqrt{d})B_d$, yielding

$$G_{n,m}(t,s) \ll_h a_{n-m}^{-d} \sum_{u \in (h\mathbb{Z}^d) \cap (\eta s + 2h\sqrt{d})B_d} F(t - u - v + hJ_d) e^{-\chi|u+v|/a_n}.$$

Take average over $v \in hI_d$. By $z = u + v$ and Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}G_{n,m}(t,s) &\ll_h a_{n-m}^{-d} \sum_{u \in (h\mathbb{Z}^d) \cap (\eta s + 2h\sqrt{d})B_d} \int_{z \in u + hI_d} F(t - z + hJ_d) e^{-\chi|z|/a_n} \mathrm{d}z \\ &\leq a_{n-m}^{-d} \int_{(\eta s + 3h\sqrt{d})B_d} F(t - z + hJ_d) e^{-\chi|z|/a_n}\, \mathrm{d}z \\ &\ll_h a_{n-m}^{-d} \int_{(\eta s + 4h\sqrt{d})B_d} F(t - z + hI_d) e^{-\chi|z|/a_n}\, \mathrm{d}z.\end{aligned}$$

Now for $s \gg_{\eta,\epsilon,h} 1$, if $|t| > \theta s$ and $z \in (\eta s + 4h\sqrt{d})B_d$, then $|z| < (\epsilon/\theta)|t|$ and so the last integral is no greater than $K(t, a_n/\chi, \epsilon/\theta, h)$. Combining the bound with (7.7) and then with (7.6),

$$f_n(s\omega) \leq \frac{1}{q_X(a_n)} \sup_{|t| > \theta s} K(t, a_n/\chi, \epsilon/\theta, h) \sum_{m=1}^{n} m a_{n-m}^{-d} \mathbb{P}\{\tau_n = m\}.$$

Similar to the argument at the end of the proof of Lemma 7.3,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m=1}^{n} m a_{n-m}^{-d} \mathbb{P}\{\tau_n = m\} &\ll a_n^{-d} \sum_{1 \leq m \leq n/2+1} m\mathbb{P}\{\tau_n = m\} + \sum_{n/2+1 < m \leq n} m\mathbb{P}\{\tau_n = m\} \\ &\ll a_n^{-d} \mathbb{E}(\tau_n) + \sum_{n/2+1 < m \leq n} \frac{n! q_X(a_n)^m}{(m-1)!(n-m)!}. \\ &\ll a_n^{-d} n q_X(a_n) + n q_X(a_n) \sum_{n/2 < m \leq n} \frac{O(1)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} \\ &\ll n q_X(a_n) \left(a_n^{-d} + \frac{O(1)^n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor !} \right) \ll n q_X(a_n) a_n^{-d}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two displays, the proof is complete. □

References

[1] Bingham, N. H., Goldie, C. M., and Teugels, J. L. (1989). *Regular variation*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. **27**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[2] Breiman, L. (1992). *Probability*. Classics in Applied Mathematics, Vol. **7**. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA. Corrected reprint of the 1968 original.

[3] Chi, Z. (2014a). Integral criteria for strong renewal theorems with infinite mean. Tech. Rep. 46, Department of Statistics, University of Connecticut.

[4] Chi, Z. (2014b). Strong renewal theorem with infinite mean beyond local large deviations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* Accepted.

[5] Denisov, D., Dieker, A. B., and Shneer, V. (2008). Large deviations for random walks under subexponentiality: the big-jump domain. *Ann. Probab.* **36**, 5, 1946–1991.

[6] Doney, R. A. (1966). An analogue of the renewal theorem in higher dimensions. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 16*, 669–684.

[7] Doney, R. A. (1997). One-sided local large deviation and renewal theorems in the case of infinite mean. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **107**, 4, 451–465.

[8] Embrechts, P. and Goldie, C. M. (1981). Comparing the tail of an infinitely divisible distribution with integrals of its Lévy measure. *Ann. Probab.* **9**, 3, 468–481.

[9] Erickson, K. B. (1970). Strong renewal theorems with infinite mean. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 151*, 263–291.

[10] Feller, W. (1971). *An introduction to probability theory and its applications. Vol. II.* Second edition. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York.

[11] Garsia, A. and Lamperti, J. (1962/1963). A discrete renewal theorem with infinite mean. *Comment. Math. Helv. 37*, 221–234.

[12] Gnedenko, B. V. (1954). On a local limit theorem for identically distributed independent summands. *Wiss. Z. Hum Humboldt-Univ. Berlin. Math.-Nat. Reihe 3*, 287–293.

[13] Miroshnikov, A. L. (1989). Bounds for the multidimensional Lévy concentration function. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **34**, 3, 535–540.

[14] Petersen, K. (1983). *Ergodic theory*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Vol. **2**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[15] Petrov, V. V. (1995). *Limit theorems of probability theory*. Oxford Studies in Probability, Vol. **4**. The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York. Sequences of independent random variables, Oxford Science Publications.

[16] Rvačeva, E. L. (1962). On domains of attraction of multi-dimensional distributions. In *Select. Transl. Math. Statist. and Probability, Vol. 2*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 183–205.

[17] Sato, K.-I. (1999). *Lévy processes and infinitely divisible distributions*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Vol. **68**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. Translated from the 1990 Japanese original, Revised by the author.

[18] Spitzer, F. (1976). *Principles of random walk*, Second ed. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 34.

[19] Stone, C. (1965). A local limit theorem for nonlattice multi-dimensional distribution functions. *Ann. Math. Stat. 36*, 546–551.

[20] Tao, T. and Vu, V. (2006). *Additive combinatorics*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Vol. **105**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[21] Uchiyama, K. (1998). Green's functions for random walks on $\mathbf{Z}^N$. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)* **77**, 1, 215–240.

[22] Vatutin, V. A. and Topchii, V. A. (2013). A key renewal theorem for heavy tail distributions with $\beta \in (0, 0.5]$. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **58**, 2, 387–396.

[23] Williamson, J. A. (1968). Random walks and Riesz kernels. *Pacific J. Math. 25*, 393–415.

[24] Yamazato, M. (1978). Unimodality of infinitely divisible distribution functions of class L. *Ann. Probab.* **6**, 4, 523–531.

[25] Zigel', G. (1981). Upper bounds for the concentration function in a Hilbert space. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **26**, 2, 335–349.